

MAY 12 1952
THE

FEBRUARY 1952

CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Horace on Art: <i>ut pictura poesis</i>	Elizabeth Hazelton Haight	157
"Trends and Events"	Dorrance S. White	162
Tullia's Engagement and Marriage to Dolabella	John H. Collins	164
Crime and Punishment in Greek Athletics	Clarence A. Forbes	169
The Isolation of Antigone and Lady Macbeth	Catherine Bradshaw Boyd	174
Virgil and Milton	Douglas Bush	178
Turnus and Satan as Epile "Villains"	Robert M. Boltwood	183
Notes		
Speaking Eyes	Eugene S. McCartney	187
On Slave Evidence in Greek Law	Alfred P. Dorjahn	188
Reincarnation	A. D. Fraser	189
<i>Ilias Latina</i> 7	Nathan Dane II	189
The Source of Vishinsky's Mouse	Chauncey E. Finch	190
Cleanthes in the Correspondence of Adams and Jefferson	F. M. Wassermann	190
Carthage and Its People	Edward J. Wolters	191
The Review Cupboard	Grundy Steiner	195
Book Reviews		
City-State and World State in Greek and Roman Political Theory until Augustus (Hammond)	J. W. Swain	199
Prudentius, with an English translation (Thomson)	George E. McCracken	199
Sextus Empiricus, <i>Against the Professors</i> (Bury tr.)	Clarence A. Forbes	200

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief and Business Manager: CLYDE MURLEY, Northwestern University.

Assistant Editor, Book Reviews: GRUNDY STEINER, Northwestern University.

"Notes": OSCAR E. NYBAKKEN, State University of Iowa.

"Trends and Events": DORRANCE S. WHITE, State University of Iowa.

"Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals": EDWARD L. BASSETT, University of Washington.

"We See by the Papers": JOHN F. LATIMER, 706 20th St., N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

For the Atlantic States: FRANKLIN B. KRAUSS, Pennsylvania State College.

For New England: JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS, Trinity College.

For the Pacific States: W. M. GREEN, University of California.

Associate Editors: GRACE L. BEEDE, University of South Dakota; W. M. GREEN, University of California; GEORGE E. LANE, Thayer Academy, Braintree, Mass.; FRANKLIN H. POTTER, State University of Iowa; F. STUART CRAWFORD, Boston University; EUGENE MILLER, University of Pittsburgh.

CORRESPONDENCE

Address all general editorial correspondence, MSS etc. to

CLYDE MURLEY, 629 Noyes St., Evanston 16, Ill.; departmental materials to the proper editors listed above; MSS from the Atlantic, New England, and Pacific States to the regional editors above; subscriptions and details of circulation to Sec'y-Treas. JOHN N. HOUGH, 8E Hellems Hall, University of Colorado, Boulder.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

The general subscription price is \$3.75 (USA), \$4.00 (foreign). Single copies 60¢ (USA), 65¢ (foreign); subscriptions for less than a year at the single copy rate. Teachers and other interested individuals may subscribe through one of the regional associations below, annual membership-subscription rate, \$3.75. Members may subscribe also to the *CLASSICAL OUTLOOK* and *CLASSICAL WEEKLY*; for rates consult the regional secretary-treasurer. Members of CAMWS and CAAS have the option of receiving either the *CLASSICAL JOURNAL* or *CLASSICAL WEEKLY* (published by CAAS)

MEMBERSHIPS

Address the Secretary-Treasurer of the appropriate regional association. CAMWS, JOHN N. HOUGH, 8E Hellems Hall, University of Colorado, Boulder. CANZ, F. STUART CRAWFORD, 735 Commonwealth Ave., Boston 15. CAAS, EUGENE MILLER, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh 13. CAPS (Northern), Miss WINIFRED E. WETER, Seattle Pacific College, Seattle 99. (Central), E. Y. LINDBRAY, Grant Union H.S., Del Paso Heights, Calif. (Southern), Mrs. JANE M. INFELD, 10476 Eastbourne Ave., Los Angeles 24. But for 1951-52 only, subscriptions to Mr. LINDBRAY as general secretary-treasurer of CAPS.

THE *CLASSICAL JOURNAL* is published by the *Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Inc.*, with the cooperation of the *Classical Association of New England*, the *Classical Association of the Pacific States*, and the *Classical Association of the Atlantic States*. The annual volume consists of eight issues (October through May).

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Menasha, Wis. on October 19, 1934 with an additional entry at Boulder, Colorado. Entered under Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on October 19, 1934.

Printed by the George Banta Publishing Company, Menasha, Wisconsin, U.S.A.

The extreme lateness of issues (owing to a financial emergency, resulting complications in Postal regulations, the absence of the Secretary-Treasurer, CAMWS, from the country, lack of clerical or other assistance to the Editor) results in inconvenience to subscribers, advertisers, printers—to all of whom, apologies abject. Even apart from this, *CJ* is about as well adapted to news coverage as the *Monumentum Ancyranum*; especially regrettable is the failure to print advance notice of

meetings and events. But copy for the remaining issues is largely with the printers, who will receive final forms as fast as contributors return their corrected galleys. Sending such special delivery is a needless expense, and is more apt to delay than facilitate receipt; for they are returned to the Post Office unless someone is on hand to sign while the Editor is teaching in another building. Improvement is at hand. *Levius fit patientia quicquid corrigere est difficile.* ED.

6, Ill.;
listed
nd, and
criptions
HN N.
olorado,

, \$4.00
n); sub-
oy rate.
ay sub-
below,
embers
OK and
al secre-
CAAS
x. Jour-
S)

ropriate
von, 82
CANE,
Ave.,
rity of
, Minn
attle 99.
Del Paso
, 104741
52 only,
ecretary-

with the
and the
n May).

al entry
postage

maining
will re-
return
cial de-
apt to
eturned
hand to
r build-
atientia

Horace on Art: *ut pictura poesis*

Elizabeth Hazelton Haight

There is, too, the influence of works of art on descriptions in poetry—not to mention the old quarrel between philosophers and poets. The work of this Vassar professor is well-known.

THERE ARE FEW classical scholars, few students of literature who do not know that Horace's "Epistle to the Pisos" started a long tradition of the Art of Poetry. How many of us, however, are aware that although Horace did not write an *Ars Pictorica*, there stems from him a theory of the Art of Painting which was of tremendous importance in the Renaissance? Two distinguished publications recently brought this to my attention: a monograph by Rensselaer W. Lee, "*Ut pictura poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting*,"¹ and a book by Irma A. Richter, "*Paragone, a comparison of the arts by Leonardo da Vinci*."² Stimulated by these directives, I reread Horace to note everything he said about works of art and his theories of art. Here are the results.

Horace's many references to works of art are not pictorial, are, rather, connotative. He presents no long descriptions like Homer's shield, Catullus' coverlet, Propertius' Temple of Palatine Apollo. He had, too, a theory about avoiding the purple patch of fine writing, *purpureus pannus*, picture of grove, of altar, of winding stream, or river Rhine, or rainbow when *nunc non erat his locus*.³ Yet he refers to many kinds of work of art: buildings public and private, statues in marble and bronze, portraits sculptured in wax

or terracotta, paintings; and minor works of art, table equipment, coins, gems, robes. Also he sketches portraits of collectors, art-dealer, art critic. How does all this material enrich his poems?

His interest in public buildings involves no architectural details, but rather by allusion gives local color, and depicts the grandeur of Rome.

He does not give us an aeroplane view of the plan of Rome. He does familiarize us with the great river winding under ancient walls, the Campus Martius, stretching level and wide in the river's curve, the hills with their sacred buildings, the Forum in the valley between them, the houses of the great, the city streets where centered the life of the humble.⁴

Incidentally, he mentions the regia, and the curia, the Temple of Vesta, the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine, the Temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline, theater and circus. And two poems involve local color by rich suggestion: the walk down the Via Sacra,⁵ the *Carmen Saeculare*. With the subtlety of pregnant words he builds up a concept of Rome's grandeur before he exalts her in unforgettable song.⁶

Alme Sol, curru nitido diem qui
promis et celas, aliusque et idem
nascaris, possis nihil urbe Roma
visere maius.

It is for the city that private wealth should be expended;⁷ it is for her temples, not for private houses that rich marbles should be used.⁸

Similar moralizing about the palaces of the rich over and over points Horace's praise of the simple life. Incidentally it shows his observation of details in house architecture. For though he declares that, after dinner at the Sabine farm, his guests and he have better things to talk about than the villas and houses of others,⁹ in his poems he inveighs against the shining villas which the yellow Tiber laves, palaces rich in marbles with panelled ceilings, porticoes surrounded by columns, attached gardens, because for poor and rich alike the narrow grave is the last home. Black cares haunt panelled ceilings. Under a poor roof man by his life may surpass kings and their friends.¹⁰

Horace was too keen a self-critic not to hear himself repeating rather pedantically these themes of the blessings of the simple life and the dangers of wealth. With delightful self-irony, he confesses that necessity conditions his philosophy:¹¹

I praise the safe, small lot when money fails, stout heart in poverty: but when my income by chance swells, I swear that you alone are wise and live well who display your wealth in shining villas.

Again he lets Damasippus, (art-dealer turned philosopher), prove that he himself is mad like all mankind by building as though he were not a little man, but Maecenas.¹²

Horace's comments on sculpture and painting are as significant as those on architecture. Honorary bronze statues with inscriptions, he knows, were coveted possessions. He tells a story of a wealthy father who on his death-bed warned each of his two sons, his heirs, never to become an ambitious politician, seeking office and squandering largess just that he might be set up in bronze.¹³ In an Ode on the curse of wealth, he exhorts those who wish to have *Pater urbium* inscribed on their statues, to earn the honor by working as good citizens against civil war and unbridled corruption.¹⁴ And at the thought of such rewards of valor, he claims that poetry can bestow more fame. Pindar can present

the victor at the Olympic games with a gift more glorious than a hundred statues.¹⁵ Horace himself can present a friend with a gift more precious than painting or marble incised with public deeds,—the gift of songs.¹⁶ Horace is already voicing that rivalry of the arts which was part of his bequest to the Italian Renaissance.

His comments on portraiture extend beyond bronze and marble statues. There were the *imagines*, the wax masks made from the faces of the dead or the living, and preserved in great entrance halls of homes. . . . *Beatus Fannius ultro delatis capsis et imagine*.¹⁷ This unknown Fannius evidently presented his manuscripts and portrait, unasked, to some private library, or friend; Horace's writings remain little known. The stupid people are stupefied by wax masks and inscriptions; Horace and Maecenas have different standards of life and virtue.¹⁸ Yet portraiture is always intriguing to the portrayed. Philip of Macedon had his head on gold staters, *regale nomisma*.¹⁹ Alexander the Great commissioned Apelles to paint his portrait, and Lysippus to represent him in bronze, the greatest artists of his time: his judgment of a poet to praise him was not so subtle.²⁰ Horace himself would not care to have his portrait done even in wax by a poor hand, or his praise sung in bad verses.²¹ The sort of portrait statuette in wax to which Horace refers is familiar from Ovid's descriptions. One of his directions to a lover for getting rid of love is to destroy the wax portraits of his enticing girl.²² "Si potes, et ceras remove: quid imagine muta carperis?" In Laodamia's letter to her husband, Protesilaus, off for the Trojan War, she tells him how in his absence she cherishes a wax portrait of him.²³ To such portraits, Juvenal also refers when he urges parents to demand that their children's teachers mould young characters as a sculptor moulds with his thumb a face in wax.²⁴ Still another type of portrait statues is referred to in the phrase *Tyrrena sigilla*.²⁵ These apparently were the terracotta Etruscan statuettes to which Pliny refers.²⁶

There are more references to painting, *pictae tabellae*, which delight men as his gold does

the miser.²⁷ They are votives, hung to show salvation from shipwreck on sea or in love, "conversation pieces" with scenes from life.²⁸ Lucilius confided his secrets to his books as if to faithful friends and, whether life went well or badly, he used no other confidant; so the whole life of the old man is revealed as if it were painted on a votive tablet.²⁹ These small paintings, which developed after the great frescoes fathered by Polygnotus, were introduced by Pausias of the Sicyon school, fellow-student of Apelles in the studio of Pamphilus. Pliny says, *parvas pingebat tabellas maxumaeque pueros*. Some were surely portraits.³⁰ Horace knew the work of Pausias, indeed may have seen some of his paintings in Rome.³¹ Davus, his slave, accuses his master of going as mad over a painting by Pausias, *Pausiaca tabella*, as he, Davus, does over drawings of gladiators in red and black crayon.³²

Pliny's Letters give evidence of how widespread in his time the possession of portraits was and in how many materials they were executed. An illustration is a letter on how Regulus mourned for his dead son:³³

Placuit status eius et imagines quam plurimum facere: hoc omnibus officinis agit: illum coloribus, illum cera, illum aere, illum argento, illum auro, ebore, marmore effingit.

In another letter Pliny reports that Herennius Severus considered it very important to set up in his library portraits of Cornelius Nepos and others.³⁴ The library of the famous villa at Herculaneum contained many sculptured portraits. Certainly many of the portraits which have come down to us, especially those of famous authors and philosophers, come from the libraries of Roman villas. In these too were found fresco portraits, for example the painting of Menander in the House of Menander at Pompeii.³⁵

Horace had an eye not only for sculpture and painting, but for minor works of art. He has much to say about table service: types of dishes, material, polish. I should like an illustrated catalogue of the dishes mentioned by him: *calix, catilla, catinus, cantharus, cratera, cyathus, echinus, guttus, lagoena, lanx, mazonomus, patella, patera, patina,*

pocula, trulla, vasa—Greek and Italian names, all shapes and sizes, of all kinds of material, of styles simple and pretentious. One man is dazzled by the splendor of silver; Albius has a craze for bronze.³⁶ At the Sabine farm for an ordinary dinner, a table with top of white marble holds two cups with a ladle, a cheap salt cellar, an oil flask and a *patera*, all Campanian ware.³⁷ But when Maecenas' birthday is celebrated, all the silver is brought out:³⁸ *ridet argento domus*. When Torquatus is invited to a vegetable dinner, he is told it will be served on a simple *patella* and he must recline on an Archias couch, whatever that was!³⁹ Very different from the simplicity of the Sabine farm are the dinners of the miser Opimius, for in spite of all his store of gold and silver plate, the poor little rich man even on holidays would ladle out his wine from a Campanian *trulla*, an unpardonable use of bronze.⁴⁰ The ostentatious Nasidienus, giving a dinner-party for Maecenas, went to the opposite extreme of extravagant display with his Greek platter, *mazonomus*, his Allifanian goblets, and his elaborate menu.⁴¹ At such a banquet, when the mind was stupefied by shining platters and tables, the talk was all about the food and drinks.⁴² There is a vast difference between vulgar display and quiet elegance at a dinner-party,⁴³ between the babble of the frivolous and the discussions of the thoughtful.⁴⁴

Jewels and textiles too fell under Horace's observation. He retells the story of Metella's pearl earring which a gay blade wished to dissolve and drink down.⁴⁵ He comments on the three rings which Priscus occasionally wore.⁴⁶ He himself wore the gold ring of the equestrian order except (according to Davus) when he went off at night to an assignation.⁴⁷ He coveted a small onyx box of perfume.⁴⁸ Perfume can help dispel cares, but neither costly gems or Coan robes of purple can bring back youth to aged Lyce.⁴⁹

Once when Horace was young, he wore *tenuis togae* though Maecenas thought he was careless in the way he put them on.⁵⁰ But he never was madly extravagant about fine robes as some were. Lucullus when asked to

lend a hundred *chlamydes* for a scenic performance, said he did not know whether he could furnish so many: he found he had at home five thousand!⁵¹ In the theater, the crowd drowned out the actor's words in applause for his violet robe.⁵²

Horace observes the madness of mankind over such possessions.⁵³

I nunc, argentum et marmor vetus aeraque artes
auspice, cum gemmis Tyrios mirare colores.

And under the caption, *nil admirari*, he writes down clearly his horror of the art collector's mad passion.⁵⁴

Gemmas, marmor, ebur, Tyrhena sigilla, tabellas,
argentum, vestes Gaetulo murice tinctas
sunt qui non habeant, est qui non curat habere.

In an Ode that might have inspired Savonarola,⁵⁵ he urges citizens who wish to possess true virtue, to free themselves from the cause of their greatest corruption, their wealth:

Vel nos in Capitolium
quo clamor vocat et turba faventium,
vel nos in mare proximum
gemmas et lapides aurum et inutile,
summi materiem mali,
mittamus, scelus si bene paenitet.
Eradenda cupidinis
pravi sunt elementa . . .

Horace sketches portraits, not only of the art collector, but of the art dealer, the art critic and the patron of the arts. The third Satire of Book Two is a dialogue between Horace and Damasippus, who had been a dealer in works of art. When business went badly, in despair he tried to kill himself, but was saved from drowning in the Tiber by a Stoic philosopher Stertinius and now himself has become a bearded *sapiens*. He relays to Horace his master's teachings on the theme "all men are mad except the philosophers." A Damasippus is known to us from Cicero's Letters.⁵⁶ He deals in statues and paintings, and also manages transactions in real estate. It is possible that Horace has made his interlocutor a character who died fifteen or twenty years before, but such a Greek name was commonly used in the world of speculation as was Davus for a slave; so we can only observe the similarity of occupation between

Cicero's Damasippus and Horace's.⁵⁷ Horace's Damasippus describes his activities as a connoisseur.⁵⁸

There was a time when my hobby was to look out for the bronze in which shrewd old Sisyphus had washed his feet, and to see what work of art was crude in the carving, what was too rough in the casting. As an expert, I valued this or that statue at a hundred thousand. As to gardens and fine houses, I was the one man that knew how to buy them at a bargain.

The conclusion is that the art dealer is as mad as the art collector.⁵⁹

Insanit veteres statuas Damasippus emendo:
integer est mentis Damasippi creditor? esto.

The art critic is presented more subtly by allusion and illustration. Horace lets his slave, Davus, rally him on his enthusiasm for paintings by Pausias which is just as mad as Davus' craze for drawings of gladiators on walls of buildings.⁶⁰

. . . nequam et cessator Davus; at ipse
subtilis veterum iudex et callidus audis.

Horace knew the fame of Apelles and Lysippus, of Parrhasius and Scopas,⁶¹ and cites them as illustrations of the greatest Greek artists. He knew the passion of the Greeks for art and what they gave to Rome.⁶² He praised Alexander's judgment as an art critic:⁶³ *iudicium subtile videndis artibus illud*. He exhorts Augustus to be as great a critic and patron of poetry as Alexander was of the arts, for

nec magis expressi voltus per aenea signa,
quam per vatis opus mores animique virorum
clarorum apparent.⁶⁴

Here again is his sense of the rivalry among the liberal arts. This jealous claim for poetry's superiority appears in the fourth Book of Odes and in the second Book of Epistles.⁶⁵ Poetry is a rival of sculpture, of painting, of the craftsman's skill.

Fain would I give my comrades store
Of bowls or pleasing bronzes, or
Of tripods, such as erst
Were prizes which Greek athletes bore,
Nor would'st thou have the worst,
Good Censorinus, had I aught
That Scopas or Parrhasius wrought,
Who, one in colours warm
And one in stone, so deftly caught
Divine or human form.

But mine are not the means for these,
Nor would such delicacies please
Thy state or taste, my friend:
Thy choice is verses; verses I
Can give, maybe can signify
The worth of what I send.⁶⁶

Horace's suggestive comparisons of the arts culminated in the Epistle to the Pisos. The *Ars Poetica*, as Fairclough pointed out, begins with the sketch of a crazy painter and ends with a sketch of a crazy poet.⁶⁷ The work of the two is, indeed, compared in the introduction and condemned *velut aegri somnia*: licence is granted to both painters and poets but within limits of harmony. Horace goes on to show that neither the fantastic nor the exotic (the *purpureus pannus*) is permitted to poet or to painter. The subject must be simple and unified; the whole must not lack art as the work of a mere craftsman does. On this thought, the dicta of the *Ars Poetica* develop, sweeping along to the clinching phrase *ut pictura poesis*. So art is justified and the work of the critic exalted, the great and honest critic, an Aristarchus, a Quintilian.

Horace's famous phrase was the embryo of a whole humanistic theory of painting in the Italian Renaissance. In his treatise on the seventeenth century theories of art in Italy, Rensselaer Lee has pointed out how they grew from classical influence.⁶⁸ Simonides' affirmation that painting is mute poetry, poetry a speaking picture was accepted as a truism.⁶⁹ Aristotle's *Poetics* and Horace's *Ars Poetica* had suggested interesting analogies between poetry and painting which the Renaissance critics developed into dogma. In a humanistic age, they "sought to invest painting with the dignity of a liberal art" and in their enthusiasm they "did not stop to ask whether an art with a different medium could reasonably submit to a borrowed aesthetic." The new *Ars Pictorica* which was thus generated had profound influence in Italy and later in France and England. A serious confusion of the arts ensued which finally produced Lessing's vigorous attempt "to redefine poetry and painting and to assign to each its proper boundaries." La Fontaine anticipated Lessing's theme in his couplet:

Les mots et les couleurs ne sont choses pareilles
Ni les yeux ne sont les oreilles.

This brief summary of Rensselaer Lee's introduction, often couched in his own phraseology, shows the significance of his work.

On a larger scale and with a different focus is Irma A. Richter's edition of the *Paragone* of Leonardo da Vinci. While the main business is the publication of the texts, printed in parallel columns for the Italian and her English translation, Miss Richter illuminates the treatise by a long introduction and by prefaces to each section. First she pictures Leonardo as artist and scientist, as musician and writer. Then she explains her arrangement of the texts under four headings: Painting and Science; Painting and Poetry; Painting, Poetry, and Music; Painting and Sculpture, and she shows that all the texts have a common theme, "the superiority of painting over all other arts."

In her section on Poetry and Painting, she shows, as Rensselaer Lee had done, the tremendous effect of the classical tradition in the Early Renaissance and how influential Aristotle and Horace were in the development of an *Ars Pictorica*, based on the classical ideas of imitation, and the pedagogical theory that art must not only delight, but must instruct. Above all, Horace's phrase *ut pictura poesis* became the motto of the Early Renaissance painters; Leonardo as their leader voiced authoritatively their claim for painting as one of the liberal arts. Raphael in his fresco of the School of Athens represented the seven Liberal Arts assembled around Plato and Aristotle in a great hall, and on the right Raphael himself and Sodoma coming in. So, Miss Richter points out, "Raphael's brush recorded the entrance of Painting into the august assembly." The parallel to Horace is obvious. Raphael the painter produced a great symbolic picture exalting his art. Horace, the poet, wrote songs about poetry in which he claimed for his art a greater glory than that of sculpture or of painting.

This essay, inspired by the work of Rensselaer Lee and Irma Richter, has attempted to show Horace's awareness of the manifesta-

tions in his time of the various arts: architecture, sculpture, painting, pottery, the craft of workers in silver and bronze, coins, gems, textiles. Included are his thumbnail sketches of collectors, his life-sized portrait of an art dealer, his standards for the critic. Through his work runs a claim for poetry as the proud rival of the other arts. And, finally, the great Epistle to the Pisos enriches his Art of Poetry by comparisons with her sister art of painting. From Horace, the Early Italian Renaissance took, I believe, both the idea of the rivalry of the Liberal Arts and the whole conception of an *Ars Pictorica*, based on his famous phrase, *ut pictura poesis*.

(For Notes see page 201)

Trends and Events

Edited by Dorrance S. White

The Robert S. Marshall Memorial Fund for the Classics has been established at the University of Pittsburgh, in memory of the donor, a prominent Pittsburgh surgeon. The income from the Fund will be used for the establishment of scholarships to encourage the study of the ancient classical languages, for the endowment of occasional lectures by distinguished classical scholars, and for the purchase of audio-visual aid materials and equipment. The Marshall Memorial Scholarships will be awarded on the freshman-sophomore level, the junior-senior level, and the graduate level, and will include a grant-in-aid for students who plan to attend the summer session of either the American Academy at Rome or the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

SCHOLARSHIPS AND GRANTS

ROCKFORD COLLEGE is again offering to an entering freshman a departmental scholarship in Latin of \$900 (\$450 for each of two years). Candidates for the scholarship must have had two or more years of Latin in high school and must write an examination testing particularly their ability to read Latin. Applications must be made by March 1, 1952. For further information applicants are requested to write to the Director of Admission, Rockford College, Rockford, Illinois.

The American Numismatic Society, located on

Broadway, New York City, between 155th and 156th streets, offers ten grants-in-aid for study in a Seminar in Numismatics to be held at its Museum, June through August, 1952. These grants will be available to students of high competence who shall have completed one year's graduate study in Classics, Archaeology, Oriental Languages, History, Economics, Art or other humanistic fields. Each study-grant will carry a stipend of \$500 plus some allowance for travel expenses to New York.

The program of the Seminar will include assigned reading, attendance at discussions conducted by visiting specialists in selected fields, preparation of a paper on a topic of the student's selection, and actual contact with the coinages related to that topic.

UNITED WE STAND

THE MOUNTAIN INTERSTATE Foreign Language Conference was formed recently at Pikeville, Kentucky, with officers from three Eastern Kentucky colleges. Mrs. Beth B. Brady, instructor in Spanish at Pikeville Junior College, was chosen as chairman. The group's chief effort will be to arouse more interest in foreign languages in the mountain areas of Kentucky, Virginia, West Virginia and Tennessee. Our own Professor J. W. D. Skiles of the University of Kentucky was the chief speaker at this conference.

At the joint meeting of modern and classical languages sections of the Iowa State Teachers Association held at Des Moines, Nov. 2, 1951, emphasis was placed on the desirability of increasing foreign language study in U.S. schools. In view of the success of the United Nations Organization located in this country (now opening its seventh year), and the obvious need of trained linguists, the advisability of beginning language study even in lower grades than is the custom was advocated.

The annual meeting of the New York State Federation of Foreign Language Teachers was held at Albany State College for Teachers, Oct. 20, 1951. One hundred fifty members were present. Professor Hayward Keniston of the University of Michigan gave the principal address. His subject was "Foreign Languages—Key to International Understanding."

A WHOLE COLLEGE STAGES A GREEK PLAY

THE DEFINITE TREND toward co-ordinating the work of one department with others in our colleges (and in some schools) is well exemplified by

the production recently at Luther College, Decorah, Iowa, of Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*. A senior student majoring in Greek provided the English version by a translation from the original Greek; the Dramatics Department staged the play; the Music Department furnished music for the odes and symphonic music for the whole play; the well-known Nordic Cathedral Choir of the college supplied members for the chorus, doubled in numbers for producing the proper volume; the Art Department helped design and construct the stage settings.

The play was a great success, a real achievement in the area of humanistic education and a demonstration of the possibilities inherent in inter-departmental co-operation.

SPRIGHTLY LATIN PAPERS

"OUR FRIEND—LATIN" is a paper of thirteen mimeographed sheets setting forth what ex-high school pupils feel the study of Latin did for them, with a fourteenth sheet enumerating "Highlights of Henderson Latin Club," or activities engaged in during the school year 1950-1951. The paper is an excellent example of what hustling Latin students and a capable faculty advisor can do. One testimony any Latin teacher would welcome runs as follows:

The Latin Club means a lot of hard work and a lot of fun. We have a lot of activities and ways to make money (such as) selling pencils and football programs at games. We have a Latin scrapbook in which to keep all the articles which came out in the paper about us, souvenirs from different places we attended and pictures of members of the Latin Clubs.

But we always let Latin come first. It has taught me to memorize and put my mind on my work. Latin means a lot to me, but all I can say is, "I love it!"

And another one:

Yes, I would gladly take Latin again. The old saying that "Latin is a dead language" is definitely not my opinion. Latin has helped me more than any other subject that I have taken. It is an old language, but very new, different, and interesting. I learned the basic foundation for the English language from Latin. Conjugation was considerably easier for me after taking Latin. . . . Yes, I would gladly encourage all students to take Latin! It is a wide-spread, inspiring, and interesting language at all times.

"Nunc et Tunc," now in its 28th year, we have mentioned before, but it is easy to see that it continues to uphold its reputation for a high standard. This Texas Latin paper is published at Waco. Note the attractive titles: "Sentimental Journey to Rome," "A Latin Student Looks at

Greece"; "Roman Influence in the Early Christian Church"; "A Scandal in the Senate" (or How Not to Translate); "Senator Macarthyus," a pointed satire; "Totalitarianism and Democracy"; "Twentieth Century Druids."

LATIN BOOK APPEAL

IT IS TRITE to say that this is a television age and that almost everything that goes into a schoolboy's brain comes in through the eye. It won't be long before youth will be unable to think with their eyes shut. Which means that unless the first-year Latin book has aesthetic appeal, that is, picture appeal, the student will close his eyes and cease to think!

I presume that few high school teachers have had an opportunity to browse around among the older first-year Latin books. If they had had, they would more keenly appreciate the art and science with which the modern Latin book is constructed. One could almost weep with pity for that departed army of youth who had to learn their Latin from those drab books that were strung along from Lily, Ward, Adam, Ruddiman, through John Clarke, Davidson, Gould, Charles Anthon, Spencer, Arnold, up to Henry M. Brun's lively *Latin Reader* of 1876, the first book to relieve two centuries of drabness.

One of the most interesting college classes in beginning Latin that I ever taught—one that the next year requested the inauguration of a course in Greek and Latin for Vocabulary-Building—was made up of ex-G I's. When asked to choose from a reserved shelf of first-year books the one that they thought they would most like to use, they chose a certain one, known to most readers of this column, in place of the unadorned and uninviting one in use. "But aren't you afraid that this book will be too elementary to challenge your sophisticated minds?" I asked. "What needs to be made simple for high school minds needs to be made simple for us," was the reply. And it is an indisputable fact that a beginning Latin textbook has to be as attractive to college students as to high school students. Theoretically, it seems sound to reason that college minds ought to learn Latin contentedly from a book entirely devoid of pictures and little digressions into Roman life. In practice, just as cows give more and better milk when music is dispensed (at least the scientists say so), so appropriate pictures and divers diversions and digressions appeal to college youth as well as to those half a decade younger. Trite or not to say so, we live in a television age.

D. S. W.

Tullia's Engagement and Marriage to Dolabella

John H. Collins

Dr. Collins, soon to be Lecturer in History at the University of Maryland is now at an Army Education Center. Communications from military bases are fairly frequent: criticisms of *CJ* and detailed suggestions for it by a Lieutenant Colonel, interpretation of an Horatian ode by a Lieutenant.

IN THE SUMMER of 51 B.C., when Cicero was leaving Italy for his proconsular year in Cilicia, the question of a third marriage for his daughter Tullia was an important care to him. He repeatedly wrote Atticus asking assistance, and more or less obscure references to the progress of the negotiations are found in the letter of the next eight months. Several candidates for Tullia's hand were considered. Finally, in May of 50, while Cicero was still at Laodicea, Tullia became formally engaged to Publius Cornelius Dolabella, whom she married in the late summer of that year, before Cicero had reached Italy on his return journey.

The marriage was not a happy one. Dolabella belonged to that *perdita iuventus* (Att. 7, 7, 6) which reflected the moral deterioration of the Roman aristocracy of the period; if he had been a few years older he would certainly have belonged to that *genus varium et mixtum et turbulentum . . . qui partim inertia, partim male gerendo negoti, partim etiam sumptibus in vetere aere alieno vacillant* (In Cat. 2, 21) that attached to Catiline. Within six months of Tullia's marriage the Civil War had broken out, and Dolabella, like the rest of the *perdita iuventus* (all those, remarks Caelius, who lived *cum timore aut mala spe*) (Fam. 8, 14, 3) had joined the Caesarians. Caesar, who liked young rascals, and who wanted to conciliate Cicero, gave Dolabella rapid promotion. He was of service to Cicero during the bad days of the civil war as a personal link between the orator and Caesar (Att. 7, 13, 3; 10, 4, 11; 11, 7, 3; Fam. 9, 9); and in one

extant letter, Caesar himself appeals to his friendship with Dolabella as a means of influencing Cicero to accept the New Order (Att. 9, 16, 3). But Dolabella's adulteries and debaucheries, his financial recklessness, and finally his agitation for *novae tabulae* in the year 47 when he held the tribunate, all combined to outrage Cicero's feelings, and formed no inconsiderable part of the load of care and misery that weighed the orator down during his year of wretched rustication at Brundisium after the Pompeian defeat at Pharsalis (Att. 11, 12, 4; 14, 2; 23, 3). In the summer of 46 the marriage was finally broken by divorce.

The main question I shall try to settle here is that of Cicero's responsibility for this unfortunate marriage. How much did he know, to what extent did he consent, and particularly, did he urge on the marriage, as Drumann asserted (*Geschichte Roms*,² 6, 616, 618) and Carcopino implies (Cicero, English Trans., 1, 162) from desire to connect himself with an aristocratic family or forward his political fortunes?

The modern feeling of romantic love, with its glorification of individual choice, was rarely a basis for marriage among the ancients. In the higher circles of Roman society, marriage was quite coolly considered as means to end. The begetting of children, the strengthening of political alliances, and the bolstering of the family position were the main objects sought. For a modern analogy, we shall do best to think of the marriage politics of the great royal houses of Europe in the 17th and 18th centuries. We may call to mind the

famous sentence on the Hapsburgs: *Bella gerant alii; tu, felix Austria, nube*. Thus did the great families of the Roman republic dispose of their sons and daughters. Every marriage was normally preceded by a more or less long drawn out diplomatic exchange which had little to do with love. "Every Roman senator," wrote Wilhelm Kroll (*Römische Erotik*, Zeitschrift f. Sexualwissenschaft, Vol. XVII, 150, July, 1930), represented in his person a part of the greatness of Rome and of Roman world power. How important a place he held depended not least on the influence of his family. The domestic and in part the foreign politics of Rome in the last centuries of the republic was essentially a family politics. The marriage of a high-ranking noble was more than a private and individual act: dynastic and financial considerations played a most significant role. Marriages were usually arranged by the parents, and this generalization holds especially for the higher classes." How important politically a marriage could be is shown forcibly by the case of Caesar and Pompey, who sealed their political alliance by the marriage to Pompey of Caesar's daughter Julia, and fell apart after her unfortunate death.

We have therefore to imagine a vigorous marriage brokerage business going on in Rome, with an organization of match-makers and middlemen of various sorts. Divorce and remarriage were so commonplace that we observe the callous attitude toward sex and many cases of Romans who were married four or five times. The complicated in-law relationships that developed are astonishing to the modern observer, but are of course not to be judged by modern moral ideas.

Cicero naturally could not escape this atmosphere. He was a *consularis* and an active politician; as a *novus homo*, he eagerly sought recognition and acceptance in the circles of the older nobility. But he was not a strict *paterfamilias* of the ancient type, and he did not manage his family affairs entirely without attention to the feelings of his wife and daughter.

The first mention of the engagement nego-

tiations is in Att. 5, 4, 1, written at Beneventum on 11 May, 51:

Gratissima est mihi tua cura de illo meo primo et maximo mandato; sed tua profectio spem meam debilitat. Ac de illo illuc quidem labor—non quo—sed inopia cogimur eo contenti esse. De illo altero, quem scribis tibi visum esse non alienum, vereor adduci ut nostra possit, et tu ais δυσδιάγνωστον esse. Equidem sum facilis, sed tu aberis, et me absente res habebit mei rationem? Nam posset aliquid, si utervis nostrum adesset, agente Servilia Servio fieri probabile. Nunc, si iam res placeat, agendi tamen viam non video.

There has been much discussion of the text and precise meaning of this passage, and the commentators are in agreement only that it is hopelessly corrupt. The exact words of the original cannot now be restored, but it seems clear that three distinct candidates for Tullia's hand are mentioned. The first, whom I shall hereafter call candidate "A," is approved hesitatingly by Cicero, *inopia cogimur eo contenti esse*. The second candidate, "B," Cicero thinks out of the question despite Atticus' approval, because Tullia cannot be persuaded to accept him. A third candidate, Servius, might be induced to marry Tullia if either Cicero or Atticus were on the spot, but in view of their absence, the affair could not be negotiated. This "Servius" is undoubtedly Servius Sulpicius Rufus, son of the learned lawyer and consul for the year 51 and his wife Postumia. Cicero seems to say that Servius could be persuaded by the good offices of Servilia, the mother of Brutus.

Tyrrell and Purser in their note on this passage (*Correspondence of Cicero*, Vol. III, p. 16) state that only two candidates are in question, whom they identify as Servius and Dolabella. They believe that the *de illo altero* of the third sentence refers to Servius; that is to say, Servius was the man whom Tullia *non adduci possit*. This idea seems to me to contradict the meaning of *agente Servilia, Servio fieri probabile*, which indicates that Servius, and not Tullia, was the difficult party to that proposed match. But this is a minor point. Tyrrell and Purser's other identification, that of candidate "A" with Dolabella, is, I think, surely incorrect, as I hope convincingly to show in the following discussion.

Of special interest is the sentence *Equidem*

sum facilis, sed tu aberis, et me absente res habebit mei rationem? The reading of the Codex Mediceus, *res habebit mirationem*, is clearly corrupt, and the many conjectural restorations show only that a universally acceptable emendation is not likely to be discovered. The reading *res habebit mei rationem*, which yields the good sense, "You will be away, and will any account be taken of me in my absence?" (E. O. Winstedt's translation, LCL) follows the emendation of Tyrrell, and is as good as any. The meat of the sentence is that Cicero's family is not blindly subject to his authority; Terentia and Tullia have wills of their own. It is important to appreciate this independence of the women when we weigh the question of who made the final decision for Tullia to marry Dolabella.

There are three brief mentions of the engagement negotiations in the letters written during the journey (Att. 5, 13, 3; 14, 3; 17, 4), but they tell us nothing new. The next important reference is dated 13 February, 50, and is written from Laodicea in Cilicia (Att. 5, 21, 14):

Reliqua sunt domestica. De ἐνδομῶν probe idem quod tu, Postumiae filio, quoniam Pontidia nugatur. Sed vellem adesses.

Cicero had received a letter in which Atticus clearly urged acceptance of Servius Sulpicius, *Postumiae filius*. Apparently the mediation of Servilia had been successful. Cicero says, *Probo . . . quoniam Pontidia nugatur*, "I approve inasmuch as Pontidia's proposals are not to be taken seriously." Who was Pontidia, and who was her candidate? The obvious answer is that the man was candidate "A" of the first reference, and that Pontidia was a go-between for him as Servilia was for Servius. This tentative identification is strengthened when we look at the next reference, written one week later, after Cicero had received another report from Atticus (6, 1, 10):

De Tullia mea tibi adsentior scripsique ad eam et ad Terentiam mihi placere. Tu enim ad me iam ante scripseras, "Ac vellem te in tuum veterem gregem retulisses." Correcta vero epistula Memmiana nihil negoti fuit; multo enim malo hunc a Pontidia quam illum a Servilia.

We have no data for identifying the Memmian here mentioned, or for determining the exact meaning of *correcta epistula Memmiana*, and speculation is useless. Aside from this little puzzle, however, the meaning of the passage is clear. Pontidia no longer *nugatur*. Her candidate has agreed, and Cicero agrees with pleasure, *multo enim malo hunc a Pontidia quam illum a Servilia*.

Pontidia cannot be further identified, but it is worth pointing out that her name proves that she did not belong to any of the politically active families. The *gens Pontidia* does not figure in any lists of magistrates or other historically known persons. A certain Marcus Pontidius is mentioned twice by Cicero (*Brutus*, 70: 246), *Etiam M. Pontidius, municeps noster, multas privatas causas agitavit* (cf. *De Or.* 2, 68: 275). Pontidia may have been related to this man; she was perhaps his daughter or niece, and her acquaintance with Cicero would be easily explainable by their common interest in Arpinum. The important point is that the *gens Pontidia* was not a senatorial family, but was very probably of equestrian rank. This assumption fits perfectly with the remark of Atticus referring to Pontidia's candidate: *Ac vellem te in tuum veterem gregem retulisses*. It seems clear that Pontidia had proposed some good, solid *eques*, perhaps an Arpinate, but certainly not a member of a patrician family active in politics.

Tyrrell and Purser's assumption that Dolabella was Pontidia's candidate seems untenable. It is clear from the present reference that Pontidia's candidate was also Atticus' preferred candidate, and that Atticus regarded the contemplated marriage as a return by Cicero to his old *grex*. This could not possibly be said of an engagement to Dolabella. I do not know on what grounds Tyrrell and Purser concluded that Dolabella was an *eques* (*Correspondence* III, 16); all the evidence seems to show that he was not. Appian (*BC* 2, 122) calls him *νέος ἀνὴρ καὶ περιώνυμος*. He certainly was a patrician, and, like Clodius in 59, had to be adopted into a plebeian *gens* in order to stand for the tribunate in 48 (see Munzer, *RE* 4, 1302).

It thus appears that in late February of 50, Cicero considered that the marriage negotiation was finally closed, and that candidate "A," proposed by Pontidia and Atticus, was the accepted son-in-law. But it required six to eight weeks for letters to pass between Rome and Cilicia, and under Terentia's and Tullia's guidance events were moving without waiting for Cicero's instructions, just as Cicero had feared when he left Italy.

The first reference to Dolabella as a possible husband for Tullia comes not from Cicero, but from Caelius, in *Fam.* 8, 6, written from Rome in February, 50:

Non dubito quin perlatum ad te sit Appium a Dolabella reum factum sane quam non ea qua existimaveram invidia; neque enim stulte Appius, qui, simul atque Dolabella accessit ad tribunal, introierat in urbem triumphique postulationem abiecerat . . .

Illud mihi occurrit, quod inter postulationem et nominis delationem uxor a Dolabella discessit. Quid mihi discedens mandaria memini; quid ego tibi scripserim te non arbitrator oblitum. Non est iam tempus plura narrandi; unum illud monere te possum, si res tibi non displicebit, tamen hoc tempore nihil de tua voluntate ostendas et expectes quem ad modum exeat ex hac causa.

We see that Cicero and Caelius had discussed Tullia's engagement before Cicero left Rome. It does not follow, however, as Brumann believed (*GR*² 6, 617) that Dolabella had been mentioned as a possible candidate. As appears from the second paragraph, Dolabella was still living with his first wife, Fabia, when Cicero left Rome. It further appears that a letter from Caelius to Cicero which has not been preserved is alluded to in the phrase *quid ego tibi scripserim te non arbitrator oblitum*. The real state of the case was evidently somewhat as follows: Cicero and Caelius talked over the desirability of getting Tullia married, and Cicero urged Caelius to look out for some suitable candidate. In the lost letter Caelius informed Cicero that Dolabella was a likely suitor; perhaps he reported some statement to that effect by Dolabella himself. There is nothing to show that Cicero had received this letter at the time he wrote Atticus, closing, as he supposed, with the proposals of Pontidia's candidate.

As Caelius pointed out the prosecution *de maiestate* brought against Appius by Dolabel-

la made it most imopportune to announce any engagement at that time. For political purposes Cicero had to remain on good terms with Appius, however he might denounce him privately to Atticus as a *fera immanis* (5, 16, 2). On receiving this letter from Caelius, therefore, Cicero wrote to Appius deploring Dolabella's conduct, and denying that he himself had had anything to do with the prosecution (*Fam.* 3, 10, 5; April, 50):

Illud vero mihi permirum accidit, tantam temeritatem fuisse in eo adulescente . . . cuius sermo stultus et puerilis erat ad me iam ante a M. Caelio . . . perscriptus . . . Ego citius cum eo, qui tuas inimicitias suscepisset, veterem coniunctionem diremissem quam novam conciliassem.

Cicero does not in this letter assume that a marriage or engagement had actually taken place, although it appears that Appius had complained that an engagement had been announced. We can show indeed that, as he wrote this letter, Cicero was hoping and expecting that a marriage would not occur. He was actually trying *veterem coniunctionem diremittere*. As he wrote, trustworthy agents (*certi homines*, *Att.* 6, 6, 1) were on their way from Cilicia to Rome with letters to Terentia and Tullia urging acceptance of the suit of Tiberius Nero, an entirely new candidate, who had traveled all the way to Laodicea to ask Cicero for Tullia's hand. It is a great pity Nero did not address himself directly to Terentia and Tullia, who held the real decisive power. But he followed good Roman custom in going to the father rather than to the daughter. By every standard he was a suitor immensely preferable to Dolabella.

Nero was apparently in Cilicia about March, 50, and Cicero wrote of him to the propraetor of Bithynia, Publius Silius, in enthusiastic terms (*Fam.* 13, 64). Unfortunately for Tullia and Cicero, the letters favoring his suit reached Rome too late to effect their purpose. Tullia engaged herself to Dolabella about May 15, as we learn from a letter of Caelius (*Fam.* 8, 13) written about June 1. Either the *certi homines* did not hurry, or the women decided to go through with the Dolabella marriage despite Cicero's preference for Nero. Although history cannot deal in "ifs,"

it is hard not to speculate on the great changes that might have resulted if only those messengers had met with more favorable winds. Nero, prevented from marrying Tullia, married Livia Drusilla, by whom he became the father of the emperor Tiberius, the grandfather of Germanicus and the emperor Claudius, and the great-grandfather of the emperor Gaius Caligula and Claudia Octavia, the wife of the emperor Nero.

In June Caelius wrote Cicero congratulating him on the engagement (*Fam.* 8, 13, 1):

Gratulor tibi adfinitate viri medius fidius optimi; nam ego de illo existimo. Cetera porro quibus adhuc ille sibi parum utilis fuit, et aetate iam decussa, et consuetudine atque auctoritate tua, pudore Tulliae, si qua restabunt, confido celeriter sublatum iri; non est enim pugnax in vitiiis neque hebes ad id quod melius sit intelligendum.

Caelius' usually shrewd judgment of men is here at fault. Dolabella turned out to be *pugnax in vitiiis*, and he was not at all reformed by the *pudor Tulliae* or the *consuetudo et auctoritas* of Cicero.

The thing having been done, Cicero had no choice but to make the best of it. His announcement to Atticus gives his real reaction (6, 1: 10 August 50):

Ego, dum in provincia omnibus rebus Appium orno, subito sum factus accusatoris eius socer. "Id quidem," inquis, "di adprobent!" Ita velim teque ita cupere certo scio. Sed crede mihi, nihil minus putaram ego, qui de Ti. Nerone, qui mecum egerat, certos homines ad mulieres miseram; qui Romam venerunt factis sponsalibus.

The whole tone of this passage is one of apology and resignation. The expression *sum factus socer*, using the passive voice, is an implied denial that Cicero himself had been consulted in the matter. Atticus' surprise and foreboding is expressed in the pious ejaculation *di adprobent!* approximately equivalent to the modern, "I wish you a lot of luck, because you're surely going to need it."

On December 9, after Cicero had reached Italy and had seen his family, he wrote the following to Atticus (7, 3, 12):

Quid superest? Etiam. Gener est suavis mihi, Tulliae, Terentiae; quantumvis vel ingeni vel humanitatis; satis est. Reliqua, quae nosti, ferenda. Scis enim quos aperuerimus, qui omnes praeter eum de quo per te egimus

reum me facerent; ipsis enim expensum nemo feret. Sed haec coram; nam multi sermonis sunt.

Again we have the note of apology to Atticus: *Reliqua, quae nosti, ferenda*. Not only had Atticus not recommended Dolabella: he had evidently warned Cicero against him, writing a catalogue of his vices. Then there is the final reference to candidate "A": *Praeter omnes eum de quo per te egimus, reum me facerent*. That is to say, Atticus' and Pontidia's candidate "A" was the one substantial and solvent gentleman in the lot. This exactly corresponds to our picture of the wealthy *eques* by whose marriage to Tullia Cicero in *suum veterem gregem rettulisset*.

The letter from Cicero to Appius Claudius in which a preliminary apology is offered for Dolabella's *temeritas* and *sermo stultus et puerilis* has already been quoted. When he wrote that letter, Cicero hoped to stop the impending marriage. He therefore does not mention Dolabella in a second letter to Appius written in June (*Fam.* 3, 11). But in August, when the water was over the dam, he again wrote Appius; and this time he flatly asserts that the marriage was contracted without his knowledge (*Fam.* 3, 12, 2):

Ego vero velim mihi Tulliaeque meae, sicut tu amicissime et suavissime optas, prospere evenire ea quae me insciente facta sunt a meis . . . quibus ego ita mandaram ut, cum tam longe afuturus essem, ad me ne referrent, agerent quod probassent.

Tyrrell and Purser speak of the "admirable affectation" of this passage; I think we need not assume any affectation. In the light of the whole history, the statement is in every essential correct: the thing was done *me insciente*. As to Cicero's approval of the engagement, a better statement could not be made than *ego mandaram ut, cum tam longe afuturus essem, ad me ne referrent, agerent quod probassent*. In that general sense, Cicero approved the Dolabella engagement. His error was not misjudgment of Dolabella's character, nor a selfish concern for his political advancement, but a certain softness and overconfidence in the prudence of his wife and daughter.

(For Note see page 186)

Crime and Punishment in Greek Athletics

Clarence A. Forbes

Subsidizing athletes was anciently criticized also. Xenophanes, a comic poet, Socrates in his Apology—all object to this unfair discrimination against mental and moral prowess. Do the alumni flock back at Ohio State, Mr. Forbes, for Phi Beta Kappa initiations?

THE RECORD of modern American and ancient Greek sports is mainly clean and honorable: a *chronique glorieuse* rather than a *chronique scandaleuse*. But America has witnessed its bad moments of corruption in golf, football, baseball, and most recently basketball. The Greeks likewise fell from grace on a few occasions, and many of the sorry facts are conspicuously written in Pausanias. The instances mentioned in this article are fortunately not numerous; they are presented here with the thought that we should look at Greek athletics steadily, without denigration and without whitewash. Even in this article we shall see that some attempts at bribery were nobly repulsed; and all the cases of corruption, cheating, and foul play add up to comparatively little.

The Sicilian Greeks were ambitious to have their place in the sun, and to rival their more easterly compatriots in art, literature, philosophy, and all the achievements that were held in highest esteem. Gelo of Gela, whose enthusiasm for athletics we know from his Olympic victory with the chariot in 488, was the original sinner in regard to proselyting athletes. When he saw Astylus of Croton win the Olympic stade-race and two-length race (*diaulos*) in 488, he was greatly impressed. After conquering and becoming ruler of Syracuse in 485, Gelo persuaded Astylus to run (and win) for Syracuse in the next two Olympics. Pausanias does not say that bribery was involved, but we assume it. The city of Croton, justly and vehemently angry, tore

down the athlete-statue of Astylus and seized his house for use as a public jail.¹

A later ruler of Syracuse, the famous tyrant Dionysius, was no less determined than Gelo to garner athletic fame for his city. In 392 or more probably 388 he sent envoys to bear a sacrifice to Olympian Zeus on the occasion of the Olympic games, but apparently he was unable to send any winning athlete. When Antipater of Miletus won the boxing in the boys' class, the envoys went to his father and offered him "gifts" (the customary Greek euphemism) if he would instruct the announcer to proclaim that the victory had been won by Antipater of Syracuse. The answer to this proposal resembled the monosyllabic retort of General McAuliffe when he was invited to surrender during the Battle of the Bulge. The bribe had failed.²

In 384, at the ninety-ninth Olympics, Dionysius was able legitimately to claim as Syracusan one Dicon of Caulonia, a habitual winner in the stade-race. Five years earlier Dionysius had conquered and destroyed Caulonia, transferring the inhabitants to Syracuse. Oblivious of these political facts, Pausanias incorrectly stated that Dicon was bribed to compete as a Syracusan.³

There was another case where a Sicilian town was able legitimately to claim an athlete of non-Sicilian provenience. Ergoteles, a distance runner of Cnossus, had to leave home permanently as a result of political strife (*stasis*). Himera welcomed him, gave him citizenship, and was happy to have the an-

nouncer at the Olympics proclaim that the winner of the long race was Ergoteles of Himera.⁴

At the hundredth Olympics a successful bribe was made by a city of Asia Minor which hungered and thirsted after athletic glory—never mind righteousness. Sotades of Crete had earned renown by winning the long race in the ninety-ninth Olympics. Governmental representatives of Ephesus gave him a money bribe to compete as an Ephesian in the hundredth Olympics. The Cretans naturally learned of this unpatriotic behavior, and they gave Sotades the very appropriate punishment of exile.⁵

A curious case, involving some dishonesty but no bribery, arose at the Olympics of 420 B.C. The Peloponnesian War was going on, and the Spartans, accused of having violated the sacred truce that prevailed just before and during the Olympic games, were excluded from religious and athletic participation in the festival. But the Spartan Lichas had a good team of chariot-horses that he thought could be winners, and he entered them dishonestly as representing the city of Thebes. The team won and Lichas rashly ran onto the track and fastened a ribbon on the head of his charioteer. This action betrayed the truth to the managers of the games, the Hellanodikai, who promptly sent their rod-bearing attendants to flog Lichas. The flogging was carried out and, despite the natural anxiety among the crowds, the Spartans made no move to intervene or retaliate. (But eighteen years later, still unforgiving, they did undertake retaliation.) The Olympic records said nothing of Lichas, but attributed the victory in the chariot-race to Thebes.⁶

The Hellanodikai maintained a high repute for integrity,⁷ and elsewhere as well as at Olympia we hear little of unfair decisions by prejudiced or bribed officials. Let us examine the few discreditable cases of this sort. In 396 B.C. three Hellanodikai, necessarily citizens of Elis, judged the stade-race, and their decision was not unanimous: two voted for the home-town boy, Eupolemus of Elis, and the other for Leon of Ambracia. Leon appealed to the Olympic Council, who fined the

two dishonestly patriotic Hellanodikai, but had no authority to reverse their unjust decision.⁸ In 372 a Hellanodikas named Troilus won two chariot races, with a team of full-grown horses and a team of foals. Pausanias hints that it did not look right for a judge to be also a competitor and a double winner, and he states that this incident caused the Eleans to enact a law forbidding the Hellanodikai to enter the chariot-races.⁹ Plutarch, in a comparison, alludes to umpires (*brabeutai*) who for improper reasons award the victor-crowns to the wrong persons, but he does not amplify his remark and gives no instances.¹⁰

In sports where the contestants had to be paired off (boxing, wrestling, and the pancratium), it was an important advantage to draw a bye. Such byes were determined by lot; and an unscrupulous athlete might endeavor to cheat in the lottery, despite a watchful official who hovered over the lottery urn, whip in hand.¹¹ Gellius tells an anecdote about the Samian athlete Echeclus, who had been dumb for years, but who broke into denunciatory exclamations when he saw an opponent "substitute a false lot"—presumably one which entitled him to a bye.¹²

Recent happenings in American athletics have focused our interest on the employment of bribes for "fixing" or "throwing" a contest; and these bribes from professional gamblers to college athletes have aroused great public indignation. In such matters not all Greek athletes and coaches were simon-pure.

Bribery first reared its ugly head right in the athletic capital, Olympia, in 388 B.C., at the 98th Olympics. The arch-villain in the piece was a boxer named Eupolus of Thessaly, who bribed his three opponents, including the winner of the previous Olympics, to let him win. The Hellanodikai, learning of this act of turpitude, imposed heavy fines on Eupolus and the three men whom he bribed. Then they used the money to erect near the stadium entrance a row of six bronze statues of Zeus, the god of Olympia. Four of the statue bases had elegiac inscriptions, recording the sordid facts and admonishing all men

that an Olympic victory is not to be gained by money, but by swiftness of foot and strength of body.¹³

A half-century elapsed before another man dared to try bribery at the Olympics. This time the man was an Athenian pentathlete named Callippus, and the year was 332, the 112th Olympics. Again he bribed the other competitors to let him win, and again the Hellanodikai learned the facts and in righteous wrath laid fines on all the guilty persons. Apparently Callippus could not pay, or else the obligation to pay rested with the sponsoring city. Mighty Athens sent its mighty orator, Hyperides himself, to persuade the city of Elis to remit the fine.¹⁴ The answer was no. Then Athens refused to pay the fine and withdrew from the Olympics. Such behavior provoked the divine wrath, and Delphic Apollo announced that he would decline to give Athens any oracle on any matter until the fine was paid. Athens paid, and up went six more bronze statues of Zeus with six elegiac inscriptions.¹⁵

The twelve bronze Zanes, as the Eleans called these statues of Zeus, apparently were effective in forestalling further bribery at Olympia until the 178th games, in 68 B.C. The wrestler Eudelus paid Philostratus of Rhodes to let him win one of the preliminary matches, and again both men were fined. Two Zanes were erected, one paid for by the wrestler's fines and the other by the disgraced city of Rhodes.¹⁶

The story begins to pall, but two more instances must be mentioned briefly. In 12 B.C. the fathers of the wrestlers Polycrator of Elis and Sosander of Smyrna conspired, with money involved, to have Polycrator win. Hence two more Zanes, paid for by the erring fathers.¹⁷ In A.D. 125 the boxers Didas and Sarapammon from the Arsinoite nome in Egypt were responsible for the newest Zanes that Pausanias saw.¹⁸

From places other than Olympia we have less information, perhaps because fewer records were available. The custom of setting up Zanes did not prevail elsewhere! In the third century at Epidaurus three athletes, a stadi-runner, a pentathlete, and a pancratiast,

were caught "corrupting the contest" and were fined 1000 staters each.¹⁹ Machon, a writer of New Comedy in this period, speaks of worthless wrestlers who were always conveniently getting defeated; and surely they were paid for their professional courtesy.²⁰

Philostratus complains that the athletes of his time, the third century of our era, lived and loved and ate luxuriously.²¹ Consequently some accepted bribes because they needed money to maintain their luxury, and others gave bribes because they were too soft to win by fair means. This was generally true, Philostratus asserts, but not at Olympia, where honesty was still the rule. He gives one example, which he says could be multiplied. A boy won in wrestling at the Isthmian games after promising a bribe of 3000 drachmas to his opponent. The next day he refused to pay, claiming that he had won simply by superiority. The opponent made the whole affair public by unashamedly taking oath in the temple that the money was due him as a bribe.

The coaches do not escape Philostratus' censure. Some of them lent money to the athletes at usurious rates, and then acted as interested advisers in regard to buying and selling victories. From the obscure writer Artemidorus we learn the story of the Syrian wrestler Leonas.²² At a festival he was winning the preliminary bouts and was sure to get the crown in the finals. His coach, being bribed, did not let him enter the finals.

A more cheerful note is struck when we hear of an athlete virtuously rejecting a proffered bribe. Plutarch tells of such a case in the Olympics, but he gives no name or date, and identifies the good athlete only as a Spartan.²³

It is very clear from Pausanias that a severe fine was the standard punishment for bribery at Olympia. Several allusions in other authors prove that elsewhere flogging, sometimes accompanied by expulsion from the stadium, was the rule.²⁴

The unknown author of a Greek *Ars Rhetorica* wrote an outline of a set of arguments that might be used in a speech against giving and taking athletic bribes.²⁵ He claims that

it was easy to detect "fixed" contests by watching the bodily movements of the athletes and by considering their performance in the training period and in previous contests. We take this *cum grano salis*; but it might be true where suspicion had been awakened and a contest was therefore being carefully watched for evidence of collusion. It would be naïve to suppose that every case of bribery was sniffed out, and snuffed out, by the vigilant officials.

Surprising is the scrupulosity of the Hellanodikai in determining what was a punishable offense against Olympic etiquette. In the seventy-sixth Olympics Theogenes of Thasos, an all-around athlete who eventually claimed 1300 victories, hoped to win in both boxing and the pancratium. Boxing came first, and with great difficulty he defeated the formidable Euthymus of Locri—and then was so exhausted that he lost in the pancratium. The Hellanodikai viewed this whole matter unsympathetically, ruled that Theogenes had entered the boxing just to spite Euthymus, and fined him one talent—no small sum. Also they forced him to pay an extra fine privately to Euthymus, and at the seventy-seventh Olympics Theogenes further made good to Euthymus by not competing in the boxing.²⁶

Here is another illustration of strict rules at Olympia. Epictetus states that an Olympic contestant who just casually got up and left was supposed to be flogged.²⁷ We know that the contestants had to undergo a month of final training at Olympia itself, and presumably Epictetus means that an athlete who once set his hand to the plough was obliged to continue and to compete in the games. Turning to Pausanias again, we learn that the Alexandrian pancratiast Sarapion got scared of his opponents and ran away on the day before the contest (A.D. 25). The Hellanodikai fined him for cowardice.²⁸ This solitary case corroborates Epictetus, except in the nature of the punishment.

Professor Hyde wrote that the Alexandrian boxer, Apollonius Rhantes, "was fined for arriving too late for the games at Olympia."²⁹ This statement is not true, as a moderately careful reading of Pausanias shows.³⁰

Apollonius arrived too late, and his lying excuse was exposed by his Alexandrian opponent Heraclides. The Hellanodikai, obeying their own rules of long standing, simply excluded him from the competition. They had no thought of fining him and it would have been unreasonable to do so. But Apollonius was furious at having his lie exposed, and he put on his boxing-gloves and "sailed into" Heraclides with both fists flying. Then the Hellanodikai rightfully intervened and fined him.

Let us turn to fouls and forbidden tricks in the contests. Here again we shall find that a leading deterrent was the omnipresent threat of whipping. Certain coins of the Empire furnish graphic testimony, for the ardent athletic interests of the Greeks appear even in numismatics. A coin of the Macedonian Beroia pictures a man with a whip—not an equestrian type, but a mastigophoros, assistant of the agonothetes. On coins of Pergamum and Lydian Philadelphia appears the same whip, intended not for a lagging horse but for an erring athlete. The urn on some of these coins is for the lot-drawing of the athletes, and the ready whip admonishes the lot-drawers not to cheat.³¹

Runners who "beat the gun" got a few raps from the official's rod. So in Herodotus' report of the debate between Themistocles and Adimantus before the battle of Salamis: "In the games, Themistocles, those who start before the signal get cudged." "But those who get left don't get crowned."³² Aristophanes humorously portrays Cleon and the Sausage-seller lined up like runners at the start in a contest for the favor of the demos, and the latter grimly warns Cleon not to poach.³³ A Spartan, noting the extreme eagerness of the Olympic runners to grasp an advantage at the start, exclaimed: "How much more zeal the runners have for speed than for justice!"³⁴ When one or more runners poached, all were recalled for a fresh start, exactly as is done today.³⁵ Runners were forbidden to hold, shove, or trip an opponent; but Lucian says that bad and unsportsmanlike runners, unable to win by speed, resorted to such fouls.³⁶ An Athenian decree honored

Nicogenes, agonothetes of the Thesea in 161/o B.C., for his general services and for taking special precautions against fouls in the torch-race and other competitions.³⁷

Mythological, but interesting, is Statius' account of what happened at the founding of the Nemean games. In a field of five runners Parthenopaeus was leading, with Idas a very close second. Parthenopaeus was wearing his hair very long in fulfilment of a religious vow, and as he came close to the finish-line and victory, Idas seized the floating locks, yanked his rival backwards, and won by a hair. As the spectators threatened to raise a riot, the umpire ordered the two to run another heat in separate lanes, and this time Parthenopaeus was an easy victor.³⁸

Vergil's readers remember the friendship of Nisus and Euryalus, and what this led to in the footrace of Book V. When Nisus, leading in the race, slipped and fell on a bloody spot, he purposely tripped Salius, the runner-up, so that Euryalus, in third position, might be the winner. Aeneas as kindly agonothetes awarded first prize to Euryalus, but gave special consolation prizes to both Nisus and Salius; thus peace was kept in the family of the Aeneadae.³⁹

One surmises that these mythological instances of fouls by runners were introduced by the poets to help enliven their story. Picturesque and amusing stories, indeed; but what about history *wie es eigentlich geschehen ist*? Factual analogues for these stories are not found.

A javelin-thrower was disqualified if he overstepped the line; but there was no other punishment, for such a foot-fault could easily be accidental.⁴⁰ The heavy sports of physical contact, wrestling, boxing, and the pancratium, offered considerable temptation and opportunity for unfair tactics. Wrestlers and pancratiasts were naturally forbidden to bite, but the familiar anecdote about the boy Alcibiades tells how he bit his opponent's hand to counter a successful wrestling grip.⁴¹ A Panathenaic amphora in the British Museum shows a pancratiast biting his opponent's arm, and an official apparently on the point of awarding the victory palm to the victim of

the foul.⁴² In a fragment of a satyr-play discovered at Oxyrhynchus the chorus of satyrs claim to be athletic fellows, skilled in wrestling, horse-racing, running, boxing, biting, and testicle-twisting.⁴³ The playwright intended the last two items to be humorous allusions to illegal practices of pancratiasts. Demonax, Cynic of the second century in Athens, was shocked at seeing many pancratiasts committing fouls and biting like lions.⁴⁴ Gardiner reproduces scenes from two vases which show pancratiasts gouging out an eye or jabbing a thumb in the mouth; in both cases an official is present with corrective rod.⁴⁵ Epictetus speaks of athletes' being beaten with rods for committing fouls.⁴⁶ A foul or any violation of the code of rules (*νόμος ἐναγώνιος*) also entailed exclusion from further competition for the crown of victory. So St. Paul wrote to Timothy in terms that the Hellenized oikumene could immediately understand: "One who competes in athletics is not crowned unless he competes lawfully."⁴⁷

Our conclusion is that corruption and foul play were never rampant in Greek athletics until the third century, when Philostratus lifts up his voice in complaint. Gardiner's more pessimistic view should be tempered by the paucity of specific facts and of moralists' denunciations. Gardiner himself points out that athletic games were always under the patronage of some god, and the fear of sacrilege deterred most athletes from sinning against the rules of the games, especially in such a holy place as Olympia.⁴⁸ The Olympic athletes and their fathers, brothers, and coaches took solemn oath beside the altar of Zeus the Oath-god that they would do no wrong in the games. The judges who were appointed to determine whether boys and foals were of a lawful age to compete in their class had to take oath in the same place that they would judge fairly and would refuse bribes.⁴⁹

Added to the religious sanctions were the rather effective policing, again notably at

(Concluded on page 202)

The Isolation of Antigone and Lady Macbeth

Catherine Bradshaw Boyd

Mrs. Boyd, who also read a paper at the last CAMWS meeting, teaches at Kimball, South Dakota. Good papers from high school teachers are always welcome.

CENTURIES APART, in civilizations vastly different from religious and philosophical standpoints, two magnificent women characters rise from the pages of great literatures. These women were not developed by the dramatists. Rather, the dramatists gave the impetus, and of themselves and of the circumstances in which they were involved the great figures of Antigone and Lady Macbeth swirled into being. Strangely enough the one is a young girl still under the guardianship of an uncle but imbued with the emotional idealism of maturity. The other, an adult woman, the wife of a weak and vacillating husband, is a creature of tremendous self-disciplinary powers.

The isolation of the two women is accomplished primarily by the character of each and by the circumstances, rebellion against recognized authority, involving them. Antigone stands condemned by the State whose proclamation she violates. This violation on her part is inspired by a tremendous sense of duty. To emphasize this force Sophocles places her against a Chorus of cold-hearted elders in whom innate selfishness and self-interest are predominant.

In the Shakespearean drama Lady Macbeth stands condemned by the laws of God and man which she has so willingly violated. Her violation is inspired by human love, intense passionate love for her husband. The sacrifices which she makes for this love are emphasized by the cruelty which she exhibits toward anyone or anything tending to keep her husband from attaining his wishes. Her ruthlessness, so at variance with the ordinary

conception of womanly character, places her apart from all other characters in the play. Her remorse for the crimes in which she has participated finds expression when she is alone and emphasizes the isolation which has originated in the horror of her character.

The most striking dissimilarity between these two is the type of action which each commits: the one is the performance of a religious and filial duty imposed by the laws of the gods and of man; the other is the violation of the laws of God and man. The performance of these actions, so diametrically opposed to each other, results in the great similarity between Antigone and Lady Macbeth, the complete isolation in which each stands throughout the respective plays. This isolation is one of the most interesting and most dramatically skillful things about the two plays.

In the Sophoclean play Antigone against the authority of Creon, a mighty ruler with power of life and death, defends the laws of the immortal gods. Her sister, Ismene, although she agrees with Antigone that Polyneices should be given due burial rites, refuses to take an active part in the deed. Her willingness to die with Antigone after the burial has been performed only emphasizes the fact that Antigone alone had the courage of her convictions. In the two scenes with Ismene this isolation is carefully stressed. It was the most natural thing in the world for Antigone to seek—and to expect—assistance from Ismene for her self-appointed task of burying Polyneices. In Antigone's mind there is no other course of action except that of dis-

obedience to Creon's edict. But the younger sister draws back in timidity. That the refusal of Ismene was a bitter blow to Antigone can be seen in every line of their succeeding conversation. Insisting upon her allegiance to the dead she stresses the spiritual rift that now separates the two of them.

In her second scene with Ismene Antigone is even more alone. Still at a high emotional peak over the burial of Polynices, Antigone scorns the desire of Ismene to die with her. She it was who first opened the rift in their common bond of devotion, sympathy and love. Now, let that rift be complete, let death separate them. During Ismene's plea with Creon, Antigone stands in scornful silence—as if she were refusing to give him the satisfaction of hearing her plead for her life. Only once does she break this silence, and that in reply to Creon's "I like not an evil wife for my son." Then from the depths of her heart comes "Haemon, beloved, how thy father wrongs thee," a cry of distress that Creon should misjudge and dishonor him. Only when she is actually on her way to her rocky vault does Antigone lament her unwed state. And even here she is reticent: not once does she make any direct reference to Haemon. The only thing she laments is: "Unwept, unfriended, without marriage song, I am led forth in my sorrow on this journey that can be delayed no more." Haemon defends Antigone to his father, but, torn between respect and love for his father and devotion to Antigone, he is unable to do much in the line of active positive resistance.

In no scene does Sophocles introduce Haemon and Antigone together, and the subordination of the love between Haemon and Antigone has given a heroine in whose mind exists but one thought, the fulfillment of a duty. Absorbed in this duty, yet conscious of earthly happiness which can never be hers, Antigone receives comfort from the faith that beyond the grave she will be united with those whom she loves.

Perhaps nothing emphasizes the isolation of Antigone so completely as do the Chorus who as representatives of the city give her little more at any time than cold approval. Con-

trary to the general convention of a Greek tragedy, the heroine in this play is a young woman against a chorus composed of Theban Elders. The presence of this sage elderly group of men brings out the loneliness of Antigone as facets display a magnificent jewel. Not only does the chorus stress the isolation of the woman, but its vacillating attitude emphasizes her determination to obey the laws of the gods.

Without doubt the chorus faintly disapprove of the decree when it is first proclaimed; and the only reason they will not violate that decree is that "no man is so foolish that he is enamoured of death." Their grief at seeing Antigone a prisoner as transgressor of the law is charged with incredulity. That a maiden in the household of the King should so forget the importance of the State and its representative as to violate a proclamation issuing from that State and representative! For the time being at least they stand on the side of the King. Even when Antigone is on her way to her death these grey-bearded elders are cold, unsympathetic, almost inhuman, in a way that isolates Antigone even more than their former half-hearted smug disapproval. They grant that Antigone obeyed the laws of the gods, but she violated a ruler's decree. She tampered with the security of the State. On the other hand, they do not fully condone Creon. With all their wavering, however, with all their advising and urging, never once do they condemn. They contemplate the events or some theme suggested by these events, and they prepare the spectator for the ensuing events; but they do not judge. This veering is of course a fine dramatic build-up for Antigone. When she is on the scene her fate and her beliefs play against the reaction of the Chorus and Creon's anger as a theme in polyphonal music. When she leaves the scene, the chorus echoes more or less faintly these same sentiments against the edict of the King as a faint second or third voice in a fugue. In regard to this veering on the part of the chorus Humphreys writes: "The chorus does not fully know its own mind until restraint to the free

exercise of its judgment is withdrawn. . . . They do not advise Creon until they see him ready to yield, and he has asked their advice. . . . Hence it is the natural selfishness of men seeking self-preservation that isolates the heroine."

It is this vacillating attitude and "natural selfishness of men seeking their own self-preservation" that isolates Antigone and forcibly impresses us with her magnificent attitude—a lonely maiden braving the wrath of a mighty ruler in order that she may fulfill her duties, a maiden who stands alone and dies alone. Against the increasing gale of circumstances her character develops more and more luminously.

NO LESS SKILLFULLY and dramatically than Sophocles isolates Antigone, Shakespeare isolates Lady Macbeth. The first reference made to Lady Macbeth is in the fourth scene of the first act where Macbeth, asking permission to bring to Lady Macbeth the tidings of Duncan's arrival, establishes his dependence on, and probably his love for, his wife. Lady Macbeth herself first appears in the fifth scene of the first act. Reading her husband's letter, Lady Macbeth realizes instantly that Macbeth would welcome the royal diadem. At once, by her passionate cry she cuts herself off from all sympathy, all consolation, all companionship. Because she feels that his nature is "too full of the milk of human kindness to catch the nearest way" she calls upon the spirits "that tend on mortal thoughts" to deprive her of all remorse, compunction, kindness, to fill her from "the crown to the toe topful of direct cruelty," to unsex her. By this cry Lady Macbeth definitely takes her place within the element of horror which Van Doren lists as one of the four characterizing elements of the play. This woman who so willingly embarks upon a life of crime is more terrible than Macbeth because of her natural delicacy and tenderness. By forcing this character upon herself in her desire to help her husband attain his ends she becomes the most fear-inspiring individual in the play. She is saved from being a complete monster only because Shakespeare with his delicate

perception and consummate knowledge of the reaction of the world to woman places the original desire for the throne in Macbeth and not in Lady Macbeth.

Her husband's dalliance and unwillingness to murder Duncan Lady Macbeth wrongfully attributes to goodness and kindness. Because of this belief she spurs herself to greater heights of determination, she becomes past master in the art of hypocrisy. But at every possible moment she urges Macbeth on to the murder, hurling as a last resort the taunt no man can take, least of all from his wife:

Art thou afraid

To be the same in thine own act and valour

As thou art in desire? . . .

When you durst do it, then you were a man.

There is no admission of failure in Lady Macbeth. By this time she has become so imbued with the desire of seeing Macbeth attain his desire that she fails to interpret his "if we fail" as the admission of a moral coward. She stands alone secure in her certainty of ultimate success and alone, too, for the moment in the full intellectual conception of the enormity of their crime.

The rushing horror of the play puts the action of the second scene of the second act on a plane in which there is no time. In this scene, however, are lines which betray the fragility, the weakness, the tenderness of the woman. She almost gloats as her husband is committing the murder; and yet, standing alone in the quiet and darkness of the night, Lady Macbeth shows for a moment a stifled yearning and desire for security and love and peace, "Had he not resembled my father as he slept I had done 't."

With Macbeth's entrance and dazed mumbling of the murder of sleep, Lady Macbeth is instantly isolated by the resumption of monstrosity as she encourages him. An interesting passage here; Macbeth, too, is isolated from everyone because of his reaction to the grooms' speech on sleep. In other words, there are here two examples of isolation, Lady Macbeth and Macbeth within a scene which is isolated in point of time and of scene not only from the rest of the play but from the universe. In bolstering Macbeth's

courage Lady Macbeth bolsters her own:

the sleeping and the dead
Are but as pictures: 'tis the eye of childhood
That fears a painted devil.

By her apparently casual acceptance of the murder of Duncan, by her sneering jibes at her husband, by her apparent indifference to the blood of her victim, she becomes a creature set apart by a strain of monstrosity we are unable to comprehend. For the time being she is the fulfillment of her plea in I, v. She is completely unsexed, a being neither male nor female whose sole substance is cruelty, conscious sadistic cruelty that has become so supreme it has for the nonce no faint excuse of being. It is this cruelty which isolates Lady Macbeth completely and absolutely and which here obliterates any sympathy inspired in us for her in act one. We have only a feeling of her repulsiveness, of shame at the degradation of qualities which make man close to God. We forget that Lady Macbeth's action arose from her love for her husband and her desire to see his every wish fulfilled; we forget that Lady Macbeth's persistence in her course of action has been inspired by her complete misunderstanding of her husband's character. We are aware only of a character projected from horror and of horror, a being devoid of any relationship with other beings.

This misunderstanding is tragically cleared in II, ii, when Macbeth boasts as a braggart and coward of his righteous indignation on seeing Duncan's body and of his own consequent killing of the grooms. In a moment Lady Macbeth comprehends the moral cowardice of her husband, whose hesitancy in committing the crime was due to a fear of earthly consequences. She perceives clearly that his lust for power which has long made him harbor the thought of the kingship is so compelling that once started on a path of murder there are no obstacles at which it will stop. Perhaps, with Macbeth's admission of the murder of the two grooms, Lady Macbeth has a sudden and perfect conception of a kingship supported and secured by the murder of innocent people.

At any rate, a subtle change takes place in her character. Perhaps she feels that Macbeth by gaining the crown has gained control of himself to the point where she must no longer take the lead, where she no longer need force upon herself the character of horror so alien to her natural self. At any rate, now her role is generally that of disciple, although it is true that occasionally she must spur Macbeth on. It would seem a moot question, however, whether she really needs to urge Macbeth on, or whether Macbeth seems to need this incitement merely to assure himself of her support.

There is something peculiarly tragic in scenes in which Macbeth and his wife appear alone. It is the tragic common knowledge of wrong, the consciousness of violation of the laws of God and man, the full awareness of the insecurity of power gained by evil; and it is accompanied by a falling apart in loneliness of this sinful man and his sinful wife. Cowardly and weak, Macbeth demands support. Lady Macbeth, upon whose finer sensibilities the enormity of their crimes has registered more than upon Macbeth's, alone possesses the determination to secure the desired ends. Regardless of the drain upon her own strength, regardless of her own growing sense of despair, she is the bulwark of her husband. Underneath this determination, however, is sickening remorse for the crimes and deep loneliness of a heart-sick soul.

Nought's had, all's spent,
When our desire is got without content:
'Tis safer to be that which we destroy
Than by destruction dwell in doubtful joy.

This is a preparation for the sleep-walking scene. But the same woman who when she is alone gives vent to such complete despair still forces herself to heights whence she can encourage her husband. Although Macbeth has learned his lesson in crime well, in plotting the murder of Banquo, his one-time fellow-general, he is his usual perturbed and uncertain self. Whether or not Lady Macbeth realizes the actual murder being planned is a question. There can be no doubt, however,

(Concluded on page 203)

Virgil and Milton

Douglas Bush

Mr. Bush, Professor of English at Harvard, read this paper as one of a series on the epic before the New England Classical Association at Wheaton College, March 31, 1950.

WHILE IT WAS NOT UNTIL the Renaissance that Homer was really read in western Europe, Virgil had enjoyed unparalleled fame through most of the fifteen centuries since his death. That fame had rested on both literary and extra-literary causes. To pass by Virgil the magician, he was the glory of the universal language, the great poetic master of learning and moral wisdom. On the strength of the fourth Eclogue he was the almost Christian prophet of Christ. In the early Middle Ages the *Aeneid* was allegorized as a pilgrim's progress—a view that I believe many modern scholars would accept, in less literal terms. Some of these attitudes are embodied in Dante. For other medieval readers, like Chaucer, the *Aeneid* was neither a pilgrim's progress nor even an epic of Rome but the romantic tragedy of the faithful Dido. Although didactic, allegorical, and romantic conceptions persisted in the 16th century, Virgil came more and more to be regarded as the supreme artist in the supreme kind of poetry, the great exemplar of epic decorum. In the 17th and 18th centuries, the age of neoclassicism, Homer and Virgil were commonly contrasted as the poets of invention and judgment, of undisciplined fire and disciplined correctness. In the 19th century Virgil was the poet of compassion, majestic in his sadness at the doubtful doom of human kind.

To turn back from this large perspective to the 17th century, we may observe a general view of Virgil which attracted many poets and critics of the Renaissance, which certainly affected Spenser and was apparently not absent from Milton's mind—that is, the notion of Virgil's career, of his moving up

from pastoral to epic, as the ideal model for the poet, who must try his wings before he essays a long flight. The idea was based partly on the facts of Virgil's successive works, partly also on the four doubtful lines that used to open the *Aeneid*—lines that Milton echoed, by the way, at the beginning of *Paradise Regained*.

Milton was from boyhood a learned and deliberate craftsman and imitator of the ancients, and throughout his early as well as his later poems we recognize the conscious artist seeking to master his art and to ally himself with the great tradition. When, at his 21st birthday, he wrote the *Nativity*, many "sources" were in his mind, but some clear echoes of Virgil show that, as E. K. Rand said long ago, the poem was among other things "an attempt to match the Pagan Messianic prophecy in a pastoral Birth Song for the real Messiah. . . ." Other early poems, the work of a poet who does not yet feel ripe for the epic, may be linked with the Virgilian tradition. *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*, as pictures of ideal days of pastoral pleasure, belong in part to the tradition of the *Georgics*. And *Lycidas* pays implicit and explicit homage to Theocritus and Virgil, though Milton's pastoral elegy becomes a Christian questioning, and Christian acceptance, of God's providence.

Before we look at the *Aeneid* and *Paradise Lost* in detail, we might take account of two general facts. One is that from Homer through Milton there is a widening gap between what may be called the theme and the material. In Homer there is no gap at all. The theme and the material are one and indivisible, because all the values of life are directly em-

bodied and exemplified in the characters and action; nothing approaches the abstract or symbolic. But Virgil's theme—whether the glorification of Rome and Italy or the idea of a pilgrim's progress—is in some degree abstract and symbolic. Virgil is a sophisticated philosophic poet whose interest is in the nature and destiny of man, not in the actualities of fighting and voyaging. Hence for Virgil's theme the concrete mould of the heroic poem is already somewhat inadequate and constricting.

Milton encountered the same kind of difficulty in a much more acute form. His theme, in his own words, was the justification of God's ways to men, though we might prefer to describe it as the conflict, in the world and in the soul of man, between Good and Evil, reason and passion, religious humility and irreligious pride. And, along with a theme that can be stated abstractly, there is the obvious fact that Milton's dramatis personae consisted of supernatural characters with not a single ordinary human being among them—for Adam and Eve are not "humanized" until they fall into sin. Thus while Milton's imaginative power generally makes us forget his special problems, at times we are aware of the gap between his partly symbolic intentions and his concrete epic material. That Milton himself was aware of his difficulties is shown by the repeated apologies put into the mouth of Raphael when he tells Adam the long story of Satan's revolt, the war in heaven, and the creation. He can only, he says, render in terms intelligible to man what is really incomprehensible. But an epic in the traditional pattern has to be a concrete narrative, and the war in heaven is at once too unreal for epic warfare and too concrete for a symbol of lawless pride and passion. Likewise, Milton's Deity, though less harsh than some critics have made him, usually becomes diminished when he speaks, and in the process acquires something of the limitations of Jupiter or Zeus.

Our second generality is related to the first, and Milton was very explicitly conscious of this also—the superiority of his theme to that of the pagan epics and the

chivalric romances of later times. In the poem to Book 9, which is to relate the fall of man, he speaks of his

Sad task, yet argument

Not less but more heroic than the wrath
Of stern Achilles on his foe pursued
Thrice fugitive about Troy wall; or rage
Of Turnus for Lavinia disespoused;
Or Neptune's ire or Juno's, that so long
Perplexed the Greek and Cytherea's son.

It is not that Milton ranks himself as a poet with or above Homer and Virgil; as artist he is a humble disciple. But, as he said many times in verse and prose, a poem written in the light of Christian faith must inevitably move on a higher level than the poetry of paganism. Long before, when public duty was calling him away from the heroic poem he dreamed of, he spoke of it as

a work not to be raised from the heat of youth or the vapors of wine, like that which flows at waste from the pen of some vulgar amorist or the trencher fury of a rhyming parasite; nor to be obtained by the invocation of Dame Memory and her siren daughters; but by devout prayer to that eternal Spirit who can enrich with all utterance and knowledge, and sends out his Seraphim, with the hallowed fire of his altar, to touch and purify the lips of whom he pleases.

It is Milton's profound sense of religious consecration that inspires his addresses to the Heavenly Muse; these are not mere epic conventions, they are prayers. And what is probably the finest single echo or transmutation of Virgil in all Milton occurs in the invocation to Light. Before we come to it, we may notice something else in the same passage. After picturing hell in the first two books, Milton is about to change the scene to heaven:

With other notes than to the Orphean lyre
I sung of Chaos and eternal Night,
Taught by the Heavenly Muse to venture down
The dark descent, and up to reascend,
Though hard and rare.

He is recalling both Ovid's account of Orpheus' going down to hell and the words of the sibyl to Aeneas:

facilis descensus Averno . . .

sed revocare gradum superasque evadere ad auras,
hoc opus, hic labor est.

Thus Milton links his own poetic journey

with two famous visits to the underworld and, in a half-paradoxical way, uses these pagan symbols to underline his own Christian theme.

Then the thought of moving from the darkness of hell to the radiance of heaven reminds him of the light that he can no longer see. But blindness has not cut him off from his beloved classical poets and the Bible:

Yet not the more
Cease I to wander where the Muses haunt
Clear spring, or shady grove, or sunny hill,
Smit with the love of sacred song; but chief
Thee, Sion, and the flowery brooks beneath
That wash thy hallowed feet, and warbling flow,
Nightly I visit.

Milton is saying what he had said so often, that he loves the pagan poets but reveres the Bible far beyond them. Yet even in saying that he remembers the conclusion of the second *Georgic*:

But first before all things may the sweet Muses receive
me, the Muses whose sacred vessels I bear, smitten with
mighty love, and may they show me the paths and the
stars of heaven . . .

And the effect, as Mr. Tillyard¹ says, is prodigious. Both passages are of high intensity, and in echoing Virgil Milton enriches both his own lines and the original; again he makes a pagan utterance reinforce his own Christian motives. And the allusion is not limited to the Muses and "ingenti percussus amore." Virgil goes on to contrast simple pastoral delights with the knowledge of cosmic secrets and human destiny—

Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas . . . ;

and the Christian poet turns from the haunts of the Muses to the brooks of Sion.

Although we are told that Milton could almost repeat Homer's two poems "without book," in his early survey of the various poetic genres he simply put Homer and Virgil (and Tasso) together as the great models for the long epic. But the neoclassical exaltation of Virgil must have affected a poet who so cherished the great principle of decorum, and some epic conventions had been standardized by the Latin poem. While Milton imitated incidental things in both

poets, for some of the larger elements in his plan he had the *Aeneid* chiefly in mind. And there were more than literary reasons. Virgil's fable was much closer to his own than Homer's narratives were—the story of the progenitor of a race led by Providence, in spite of defeat and sin, to a new vision and the realization of man's future.

On the question of structure I should like to summarize the very suggestive argument of Professor Arthur Barker,² though a brief reference does it grievously injustice. The *Aeneid*, according to old critical tradition, has two equal parts, corresponding to the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*, but it can also be viewed in three sections of four books each—the first concerned with Troy and Dido, the second carrying Aeneas through his landing in Italy, the third recounting his conquest and the fulfilment of his destiny. A partly parallel pattern exists in *Paradise Lost*, though it was less clear in the ten books of the first edition. Milton's later division into twelve books brought the poem closer to the *Aeneid* in more than a numerical way. It made three sections or movements of four books each, centering respectively on Satan, Christ, and man. The new arrangement had the further effect of reducing the tragic emphasis on the fall and increasing emphasis on man's restoration. And it perhaps did something to lessen the importance of Satan, though apparently not enough; to add a remark that Mr. Barker might not disagree with, Milton may unwittingly have aroused undue sympathy for Satan as Virgil unwittingly aroused it for Dido, who, like Satan, stood in the way of divine order.

We must turn to more concrete adaptations. Although an immense amount of material had gathered about the stories of creation and the fall, Milton's fable was still of a very different kind from the fables of Homer and Virgil, and he drew upon them and the whole body of classical, Hebrew, and Christian writing in order to give actuality to his characters and events. Many imitations, large and small, are of necessity done silently and are expected to be recognized by the reader; when, on the other hand, Milton makes an

open mythological allusion he generally labels it pagan fiction, by way of apology for using it in a sacred poem. But everything he borrows or imitates is re-created, as Virgil had re-created his imitations of Homer.

One epic motive is the roll-call of fallen angels in Book I. The catalogue of the ships in the *Iliad* is the one barren part of Homer, though for the Greeks it may have had the attraction of a passenger list from the *Mayflower*. This device was brought to life by Virgil in the 7th book of the *Aeneid*. The Italian chiefs who assemble to oppose Aeneas are, to be sure, enemies of the cause which is ordained to triumph, yet Virgil uses the opportunity to celebrate the various districts and local legends of his beloved Italy. Milton's fallen angels, whom old tradition identified with the heathen gods, are, like Virgil's chiefs, the enemies of righteousness and Providence, on a much grander and more evil scale, and Milton can only pour out condemnation upon them. The result is great poetry partly because the biblical and historical materials had dwelt so long in his imagination.

Like Homer and Virgil, Milton staged councils both in heaven and below. The heavenly councils, though important for his theme, create problems that not even he can quite overcome, but the full-dress debate of the fallen angels is such a powerful elaboration of the epic convention that it stands virtually alone in our minds. The substance of the speeches is of course remote from the classical, but the descriptions of the speakers, the reports of their reception, and sometimes their oratorical devices, remind us of the councils in Homer and the *Aeneid*. One particular link is the simile following Mammon's speech; though original in its details, it recalls some similes Virgil uses after speeches:

He scarce had finished, when such murmur filled
The assembly, as when hollow rocks retain
The sound of blustering winds, which all night long
Had roused the sea, now with hoarse cadence lull
Sea-faring men o'erwatched, whose bark by chance
Or pinnacle anchors in a craggy bay
After the tempest.

When the council breaks up and Satan sets

forth on his solitary expedition to the new earth, his followers entertain themselves in various ways. Milton's hell, created for them, is not the ordinary hell, since it has as yet no human occupants, and it is not the Hades of pallid ghosts and lamentation and lethargy. The epic games which in Homer and Virgil are the tribute of the living to the dead are given to the fallen angels, and now as before Milton's hell is a scene of energetic action. Then in the ancient poems funeral games are wholly athletic and military. But Virgil has poets singing in the underworld, and Milton allows some of his devils to sing with ravishing harmony. And he goes beyond Virgil in describing another group who sat apart and

reasoned high
Of providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate,
Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute,
And found no end, in wandering mazes lost.

The spiritual blindness shown in futile debates on problems of philosophy is shown also in other angels' exploration of the further reaches of hell, the regions of cold and monstrous forms of life—symbols of the anarchic disorder of their minds.

The two largest epic conventions are recapitulation of the past and prophecy of the future. In the *Odyssey* the hero's story of the past is one of personal adventure and endurance. Aeneas' account of the fall of Troy and his years of wandering has a private and ethical significance, but it is at the same time part of Virgil's public theme, the end of an era and of a world, and the beginning of another. Milton's recapitulation of the past, which occupies the middle books of the poem, has a similar double import. Raphael tells Adam of God's designation of his Son as king and mediator, of Satan's rebellion and the war in heaven, and of Christ's creation of the world that followed the chaos of destruction. The story is at once an account of God's purposes in creation and a warning to Adam through the example of Satan's disobedience; and it too contains an end and a beginning.

To mention one detail, it is highly significant that Raphael opens his narrative with a

statement of the divine order of the world and the great chain of being:

O Adam, one Almighty is, from whom
All things proceed, and up to him return,
If not depraved from good, created all
Such to perfection, one first matter all,
Endued with various forms, various degrees
Of substance, and in things that live, of life. . . .

Milton could hardly have composed these lines without recalling the first long speech of Anchises to Aeneas in the underworld:

In the first place, a living power feeds the sky and earth and the liquid fields of ocean and the shining globe of the moon and the Titanian stars; a mind that interpenetrates all the parts keeps the whole mass in motion and mingles itself with the great frame of the universe. Thence springs the race of men and beasts. . . .

It may be added that, while the chain of being was a main article of Christian orthodoxy, the Miltonic passage goes on to expound a quite unorthodox monism which denies any basic difference between matter and spirit.

The last major epic device is the prophecy of the future, which Virgil elaborated far beyond the prophetic episode in the *Odyssey*. Aeneas' experience in the underworld is a kind of religious initiation and consecration which leads to the unfolding of his destiny and the destiny of Rome. Milton (who like Virgil has many minor prophetic passages) gives most of his last two books to a corresponding revelation, which was sanctioned by both epic example and imaginative treatments of the fall of man. Michael, sent from heaven to banish Adam and Eve from Paradise, takes Adam to a hill-top and displays, through a series of visions and through narrative, the history of his descendants. The unifying theme is given in Michael's words:

Good with bad
Expect to hear, supernal grace contending
With sinfulness of men—

a theme less cheering than the future of Rome, though it leads eventually to the birth of Christ, the second Adam, who shall regain what the first Adam lost. In the middle of his revelation Michael pauses "Betwixt the world destroyed and world restored," and

the phrase might be applied to the whole poem. It might also be applied to the *Aeneid*. As C. S. Lewis says, in his fine chapter on Virgil, the whole *Aeneid* is the story of a transition in the world-order,

the shift of civilization from the East to the West, the transformation of the little remnant, the *reliquias*, of the old, into the germ of the new. Hence the sadness of farewells and the alacrity of new beginnings . . . dominate the whole poem . . . In a sense he [Aeneas] is a ghost of Troy until he becomes the father of Rome. All through the poem we are turning that corner.³

So in Milton the loss of Paradise leads, through sin and suffering, to the vision of a new paradise.

There is no time for illustration of Virgilian details, though we have noticed two or three, and a few more may be briefly added. These are sometimes incidental; sometimes they are very significant.

In the first lines of his first great speech, Satan, in the fiery lake, addresses his lieutenant, Beelzebub:

If thou beest he—but O how fallen! how changed
From him, who in the happy realms of light. . . .

Here we have a potent fusion of Isaiah—"How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!"—with Aeneas' vision of the bloodstained Hector, once the light of Troy, "*quantum mutatus ab illo Hectore*" who had been the city's great defender.

At the end of Book 7, Raphael ends his narrative with the song sung by the angels in celebration of the newly created world and the new race of men, who shall be

thrice happy if they know
Their happiness, and persevere upright.

This concluding phrase comes just before Adam's curiosity leads to his questions about the celestial system, and is a half-direct warning against the desire for godlike knowledge which is to seduce Eve and Adam. And it is given a kind of solid actuality by recalling the passage already cited from the second *Georgic*, where Virgil apostrophizes the humble farmers who are happy if they know their blessings and resist the lures of ambition.

(Concluded on page 203)

Turnus and Satan as Epic "Villains"

Robert M. Boltwood

Aeneas is often regarded as the Achilles, Turnus as the Hector (and so hardly the villain), of the Aeneid. Mezentius seems more like Satan; and the two poets are compelled to reluctant admiration of the two. But Spaeth (CJ, March, '51) offers Aeneas as Hector, Turnus as Achilles; despite the tragic fault Spaeth's predecessor Bassett found in Achilles, he does not fit the villain rôle either. Perhaps the Classics are short on villains; Aristotle discards them for tragedy, though the leno of New Comedy could be such. Mr. Boltwood is Education Supervisor, Department of Industrial Education, Chrysler Corporation.

THE BASIS of any attempt to compare Virgil's Turnus and Milton's Satan as epic "villains" should be recognition that they are governed by different motives and seek different means of satisfaction in conformity with their essential characters. Furthermore, there should be acknowledgment that neither Turnus nor Satan is a "villain" in the strictest sense of the word, for both are engaged in mighty efforts to make their own strongly held conceptions of justice and right prevail in a sordid atmosphere of personally experienced injustice. Of the two personages, of course, Satan is admittedly the more villainous if villainy may be interpreted conveniently as the craving to perpetrate evil and malice because of villainy formerly practiced upon oneself by others.

Virgil does not make too clear Turnus' fundamental motive for going to so much bloody trouble to vanquish the Trojan forces invading Italy. Certainly his affection for Lavinia, with the accompanying fear he will lose her to Aeneas, does not account entirely for the tremendous quantity of enemy blood he spills in a short time, for there is actually very little emphasis on the love existing between Turnus and Lavinia. The high point of their romance occurs when Lavinia becomes emotionally aroused to the extent of blushing in the presence of Turnus, while love "throws him into tumult" (238). Even more curiously, Allecto utterly fails to stir up Turnus against the Trojans until she changes

her appearance and pounces upon the artificial but most effective device of a "lurid smoking brand," (140) with which she pierces the breast of Turnus, who immediately grows enraged with the idea of expelling Latinus and the Trojans and establishing himself as king of Italy.

This startling transformation, obviously too much the result of divine persuasion, not only proves unconvincing but conjures up a picture of Turnus as just another military figure glorying in carnage and violence for their own sake and for promotion of his own prestige. Hence this questionable nature of Turnus' motivation makes him not so much a scheming villain as a stalwart hero eager to contend with Aeneas on an equal footing for the spoils of war and for military glory. Except on an occasion like the one when Juno hustles him out to sea, Turnus always meets the enemy in a fair and square fight. Because of such bravery he can be considered a villain only in the debatable sense of the opponent of an avowed hero. It is significant that Virgil himself calls Turnus a hero.

On the other hand, Milton very clearly and early reveals Satan's fundamental motive as a deep inner desire to avenge the mortification of being cast out of heaven by God. Vows Satan in his introductory speech:

To bow and sue for grace
With suppliant knee, and deify his power,
Who from the terror of this arm so late
Doubted his empire, that were low indeed,

That were an ignominy and shame beneath
 This downfall; since by fate the strength of gods
 And this empyreal substance cannot fail,
 Since through experience of this great event
 In arms not worse, in foresight much advanced,
 We may with more successful hope resolve
 To wage by force or guile eternal war
 Irreconcilable, to our grand foe,
 Who now triumphs, and in the excess of joy
 Sole reigning holds the tyranny of heaven.

P.L. 1.111-124

The very pride and attitude of opportunism which caused Satan to question and challenge the supreme authority of God in the latter's despotic realm have been seriously set back. Certainly Satan has no need of a goddess-applied "lurid smoking brand" to help him make up his mind about the necessity of immediate and forceful action. His passion for revenge springs from his very nature as a proud and arrogant being who cannot tolerate being thwarted or disciplined by a superior. Because Satan's motivation is thus primarily one of frustrated ambition, he has to depend more on his intellect than on his body to purge himself of the stigma of ignominious defeat. Therefore Satan is practically compelled to play the role of a villain rather than of a hero, for his intensity of pride and his rage for vengeance necessitate craft and cunning, not valor and true manliness. Turnus heroically holds the welfare of the Italian people close to his heart as he slaughters invading Trojans, whereas Satan evilly deceives Eve, and through her Adam, for his own purely selfish end of getting even with God. Satan himself succinctly states his goal:

To do aught good never will be our task,
 But ever to do ill our sole delight,
 As being contrary to his high will
 Whom we resist.

P.L. 1.159-162

Comments by the poets and by additional characters in the *Aeneid* and *Paradise Lost* offer further reliable support for this idea that Turnus is much more a hero than a villain, and Satan much more a villain than a hero. Turnus always gets commendatory epithets, such as the recurrent "bold Turnus," "gallant Turnus," and "mighty Turnus." In fact only one fellow-soldier, Drances, expresses an unfavorable opinion of Turnus, whom he

jealously charges with sacrificing Italian troops for the sake of Lavinia—a charge which Turnus answers at length with all the venomous oratory of which he is capable. Aeneas, of course, gives no evidence of doubting the superb military competence of Turnus. But the case is different with Satan, who is always presented in a bad light as a highly suspect character who will stop at nothing, including selling his own soul, to get what he wants. Satan appears as an "infernal serpent," "subtle fiend," "false dissembler," "artificer of fraud," and in various other uncomplimentary guises. In the minds of associates like Beelzebub, Belial, Moloch, and Mammon, all of whom realize how futile their cautionary arguments are, Satan becomes a solitary figure commanding respect through fear:

Towards him they bend
 With awful reverence prone; and as a god
 Extol him equal to the highest in heaven.

P.L. II.477-479

Whatever heroic stature Satan does have may be traced to his resolute determination to do evil and thus harass his kingly opponent in heaven. He never once wavers, adopting every ingenious means possible to push himself through the carefully guarded entrance to the Garden of Eden. The solemn counsels of his fellow-sufferers in hell mean nothing to him, nor does he crave companionship on his precarious mission, sternly declaring that "this enterprise none shall partake with me" (II. 465-6). Furthermore, Satan's masterful speeches are by no means those of an ordinary villain equipped with a small mind and a low degree of articulation. Whether or not these highly quotable passages are always consistent with the jealous, treacherous soul of a character like Satan, he nevertheless loftily expounds the doctrines which Milton sets forth in his other writings as well. For instance, to cite a brief passage, Satan says that

The mind is its own place, and in itself
 Can make a heaven of hell, a hell of heaven.

I.254-255

And it is a rare villainous mind that will so poetically evaluate its failures as does Satan's:

O foul descent! that I who erst contended
 With gods to sit the highest, am now constrained
 Into a beast, and mixed with bestial slime,
 This essence to incarnate and imbrute,
 That to the height of deity aspired;
 But what will not ambition and revenge
 Descend to? who aspires must down as low
 As high he soared, obnoxious first or last
 To basest things.

IX.163-171

Turnus' steadfastness of purpose, observed equally by the Roman poet, depends on both spiritual resolution and bodily stamina. He is psychologically ready to wage war against the forces of Aeneas so long as his physical frame and weapons will take the gruelling punishment meted out by battle-hardened, spear-hurling Trojan warriors. His address to his own spear is indicative of his unyielding ruggedness: "Now, O spear that never hast failed at my call, now the time is come; thee princely Actor once, thee Turnus now wields in his grasp. Grant this strong hand to strike down the effeminate Phrygian, to rend and shatter the corslet, and defile in dust the locks curled with hot iron and wet with myrrh" (239).

Unlike Satan, Turnus is limited in general to the speeches of bare utility commonly associated with the military man. Occasionally he departs from this pattern, for example, when he speaks to the goddess Iris somewhat poetically: "Iris, grace of the sky, who has driven thee down the clouds to me and borne thee to earth? Whence is this sudden sheen of weather? I see the sky parting asunder, and the wandering stars in the firmament. I follow the high omen, whoso thou art that callest me to arms" (169). And on another occasion Turnus is in a philosophic mood, much the way Satan might be as the mouth-piece of Milton: "Often do the Days and the varying change of toiling Time restore prosperity; often Fortune in broken visits makes man her sport and again establishes him" (224).

A further problem in comparing Turnus and Satan as epic "villains" arises from the disturbing presence of intangible superhuman elements, especially in the *Aeneid*. The costly conflict between the Italians and Trojans, between Turnus and Aeneas, comes

about because Juno wants to block the desires and ambitions of Venus. From the moment he is prodded into sudden action by Allecto to the event of his death struggle, Turnus seems to be a plaything manipulated by Juno. True, when not bothered directly by divinity he valiantly asserts his impressive prowess as a warrior, chopping off numerous enemy heads and limbs; but whenever stark danger is imminent, as when he discovers he has the wrong sword, divine beings hasten to his aid and prolong his life. All this divine intervention reaches its high point when Jupiter feels called upon to remind Juno that affairs have gone far enough and that it is time to accord Aeneas due recognition: "Aeneas is claimed by Heaven as his country's god, thou thyself knowest and avowest to know, and is lifted by fate to the stars" (257). And for fear Juno does not fully grasp the implication, Jupiter adds: "The end is come. Thou hast had power to hunt the Trojans on land or wave, to kindle accursed war, to put the house in mourning, and plunge the bridal in grief: further attempt I forbid thee" (257).

The power of Jupiter is well exemplified when he dispatches to earth the "daughter of Night" (258), who transforms herself into a small bird to terrify Turnus: "A strange numbing terror unnerves his limbs, his hair thrills up, and the voice in his throat was choked" (258-259). From a much earlier point in the story, of course, the fates have found utterance through the oracles of Latinus' ancestral shrine. Though there has never been any real question about Aeneas' eventual winning of Italy, Turnus ironically tells his troops: "In no wise am I dismayed by those divine oracles of doom that the Phrygians insolently advance. Fate and Venus are satisfied, in that the Trojans have touched our fruitful Ausonian fields. I too have my destiny against theirs, to put utterly to the sword the guilty nation who have robbed me of my bride; not the sons of Atreus alone feel that pain, nor may Mycenae alone take arms." (172).

Such external controls, in short, tend to weaken for the modern reader the otherwise dynamic appeal of Turnus' manliness and

courage. There is certainly something truly heroic about a man struggling courageously against his destiny, but at times—again in terms of the modern reader—Turnus is too much the pawn of seemingly artificial forces employing him merely as a ready means of keeping Aeneas' conquest of Italy from being too simple and straightforward an operation.

Milton's ambition to "justify the ways of God to men" (1, 26) places divine influence at a minimum once Satan, himself superhuman, has been banished from heaven. God is aware that the arch-enemy's unbounded pride and eagerness for revenge, if allowed to become intensified and directed, will ultimately accomplish what God intends, namely, the temptation of Eve in the Garden of Eden. Like Satan, both Adam and Eve have been granted freedom of will by God,

who in all things wise and just,
Hindered not Satan to attempt the mind
Of man, with strength entire, and free will armed,
Complete to have discovered and repulsed
Whatever wiles of foe or seeming friend.

x.7-11

Perhaps the most persuasive clue to the essential roles of Turnus and Satan lies in their final proximity to their goals. Satan in his subtle temptation of Eve and Turnus in his rough encounter with Aeneas represent, respectively, the most discernible roles of villainy and heroism. Satan's characteristic of "meditated fraud and malice" finds expression in the guise of a villainous serpent. This entire temptation scene is a masterpiece of cunning persuasion as Satan slyly plays on Eve's emotions, using all the tricks of ancient oratory and making much of the Miltonic idea that evil must be experienced to be known at all. Thus Satan, despite his heroic steadfastness of purpose and his memorable expression of profound poetic sentiments, comes to symbolize evil disguised as a serpent.

Truly heroic, on the other hand, is Turnus' desperate battle with Aeneas, even to the hurling of a stone so heavy that "scarcely might twelve chosen men lift it on their shoulders" (259). In the best heroic tradition Turnus trades blows with Aeneas. Unfortunately, however, again the divine

forces are at work, for "the awful goddess brings to naught all the valour of Turnus where he seeks a way" (260). Certainly difficult for the modern reader to excuse, at least on literary grounds, is the slaying of valiant Turnus by Aeneas, because a backward glance over the epic reveals that Turnus killed Pallas in self-defense. The conclusion is inevitable, then, that just as Milton uses Satan to explain the presence of sin and evil in the world, so Virgil uses Turnus as heroic opposition to Aeneas' designs on Italy. In both instances the characters, one primarily villainous and the other primarily heroic, are employed as means to an end greater in each case than themselves.

ENGAGEMENT

(from page 168)

CHRONOLOGICAL NOTE

Fam. 13, 64, in which Nero's visit to Cilicia is mentioned, is dated by Tyrrell and Purser in December or January. Purser, however, in his edition of *Ad Familiares* for the Oxford Classical Texts (1901), dates the letter along with *Fam.* 13, 63 and 54, in March or April of 50. I can discover no internal indications of date except the mention of Nero's visit; that this could have been as early as January seems to me untenable. The marriage offer at least could not have been made until after 20 February, the date of *Att.* 6, 1; for it is inconceivable that Cicero would have written the paragraph quoted above (*De Tullia mea tibi adsentior . . .*) if he was closing with a new offer from Nero. I therefore think Purser's dating (in agreement with O. E. Schmidt's *Briefwechsel*) for *Fam.* 13, 64 as April is to be preferred, and believe that Nero visited Cicero in March or April.

P. Groebe (article *Tullia*, *RE* 7-A2, 1332) refers to *Fam.* 7, 32 to support his assertion that Cicero "bereits im Februar 50 mit der Bewerbung Dolabellas sich befreundet hatte." This letter to Publius Volumnius contains the sentence, *Praeterea Dolabellam, quem ego perspicio et iudico cupidissimum esse amantissimum mei, cohortare et confirma et redde plane meum, non mehercule quo quicquam desit; sed quia valde ei cupio, non video nimum laborare.*

This letter is commonly (Tyrrell-Purser) dated in February, but I see no indication placing it earlier than April or May. I believe that the letter was written after Cicero had received the announcement from Caelius of the probability of the Dolabella engagement. He had already sent the messengers to Rome with his acceptance of Nero's offer. *Fam.* 7, 32 represents his attempt to smooth things over with Dolabella, and to provide for the contingency that (as things actually worked out) the Nero negotiation would fall through.

NOTES

SPEAKING EYES

FOR THE word *boopis*,¹ which is often applied to Hera by Homer, Hesychius gives the meanings *megaloophthalmos* ("large-eyed") *euophthalmos* ("fair-eyed"), and *megalo-phonos*. Since the Greeks exalted moderation in speech (*oligomythia*) and even silence as feminine virtues,² the translation "loud-voiced" is precluded for the last definition. "Grandiloquent" would be equally out of place, for no cultivated Greek could tolerate bombast or pomposity. It is obvious that Hesychius, an Alexandrine scholar of the fifth (?) century, did not use the word in either of its customary senses. If one may interpret *megalo-phonos* as meaning "great-speaking" (i.e. expressive) rather than as "loud-speaking" or "mighty-speaking," it becomes readily understandable in this connection, but I suspect that no Athenian of the classical period would have used *megalo-phonos* to explain *boopis*.

In the language of gesture, which Cicero (*De Orat.* 3.59.222) describes as *quasi sermo corporis*, the eyes are the most eloquent parts of the body. Cicero (*De Leg.* 1.9.27) remarks that they tell how we are disposed: *Nam et oculi nimis arguti quem ad modum animo simul affecti loquuntur*. Quintilian (11.3.75) observes that they reveal the temper of the mind, and Lactantius (*De Opificio Dei* 8.12; 9.2) regards them as indexes of the thoughts and wishes and says that the mind uses them as windows, so to speak. After enumerating a number of qualities and attitudes that are reflected in the eyes, Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* 11.145) tersely concludes: *Profecto in oculis animus habitat*.³

The terminology of speech is often transferred to expressive eyes. According to the passage just quoted from Cicero, *oculi loquuntur*, and Tibullus (12.6.43) describes eyes as *loquaces*. In Ovid (*Amores* 2.5.17) a lover

Contributions to this department in the form of brief objective notes should be sent direct to the editor, Oscar E. Nybakken, State University of Iowa, 124 Schaeffer Hall, Iowa City, Iowa.

represents the eyes of his beloved as failing to keep silent (*Non oculi tacuere tui*). Quintilian (11.3.72) remarks of the *vultus*: *Hic est saepe pro omnibus verbis*.

In the *Greek Anthology* a certain Aristagoras prattles (*lalei*) delightfully with his eyes even when he is silent (1.122), and Myiscus' eyes speak (*lalei*) to the deaf (12.159).

Excellent illustrations of the way modern authors attribute to the eyes the power of speaking and communicating may be found in Shakespeare:

Sometimes from her eyes

I did receive fair speechless messages.

—*Merchant of Venice* 1.1.163-164

There's language in her eye, her cheek, her lip . . .

—*Troilus and Cressida* 1v.v.55

By the heart's still rhetoric, disclosed with eyes. . . .

—*Love's Labour's Lost* 11.1.229

She speaks, yet she says nothing. What of that?

Her eye discourses.

—*Romeo and Juliet* 11.11.12-13

For an example of imperious eyes we may quote from Ilya Tolstoy's biography of his father:

My mother often scolded us and punished us; but when my father wanted to make us do something, he merely looked us hard in the eyes, and we understood: his look was far more effective than any command.⁴

To return to Hesychius and Hera, the dictionary definitions of *megalo-phonos*, "loud-voiced" and "grandiloquent," do not suggest any qualities that we regard as queenly even in a human being, much less those of a queen of the gods. Nor do they accord with the complimentary *megaloophthalmos* and *euophthalmos* or with the Greek stress upon restraint in speech as an ideal for women. The writers of the classical period use the word of strong-lunged heralds and of persons who ranted and blustered. Sometimes it has evil companions, as in "loud-voiced and shameless"⁵ and "loud-mouthed and insolent."⁶ May not Hesychius have meant that Hera's

eyes were greatly (*megalo-*) expressive, that they silently bespoke her wishes, thoughts, and feelings? In the *sermo corporis* of the Greeks and Romans the use of facial expression and gestures was far more extensive than it is among us.⁷ Even by her manner of walking Hera showed that she was divine,⁸ and it would have been natural for Hesychius to regard her eyes as revealing the qualities that become a goddess who is also a queen.

EUGENE S. MCCARTNEY

University of Michigan

NOTES

¹ I have made some comments on oxen and ox eyes in an article "The Epithet 'Boopis,'" *THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL* 46 (1951), 348-349.

² Sophocles, *Ajax* 293, says that silence gives grace to women, a view that Aristotle quotes with approval in his *Politics* 1.5.8. See also Euripides, *Heracleidae* 476; Plut., *Mor.* 142D; and Democritus as quoted by Stobaeus, *Flor.* 74.38. Cf. Plaut. *Rudens* 1114: *Eo tacent quia tacitast melior mulier semper quam loquens.*

³ Cf. Matthew 6.22: "The light of the body is the eye."

⁴ Ilya Tolstoy, *Reminiscences of Tolstoy* (New York, 1914), 214-215.

⁵ Demosthenes, *De Falsa Legatione* 238.

⁶ Lucian, *Bis Accusatus* 11.

⁷ See the interesting book by Carl Sittl, *Die Gebräuden der Griechen und Römer* (Leipzig, 1890).

⁸ Vergil, *Aeneid* 1.46: *ego quae diuum incedo regina.* In 1.405 Vergil says of Venus: *et vera incesu patuit dea.* The dignity and grace in the eyes of Demeter were like the same qualities in the eyes of kings that dealt justice. See *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 214-215.

ON SLAVE EVIDENCE IN GREEK LAW

IN FIFTH and fourth century Athens, slaves were not competent witnesses, unless their testimony was obtained under torture. Evidence thus obtained, however, is highly extolled by Isaeus (viii, 12), Isocrates (xvii, 54) and Demosthenes (xxx, 37); in fact, it is regarded by them as being more trustworthy than the depositions of free men. In view of this fact, it is indeed odd that evidence extracted from slaves never appears in any of the suits that constitute the extant body of the forensic oratory of fifth and fourth century Athens.

In Roman law, torture was employed in civil as well as in criminal cases with certain

restrictions. In the Republic, only slaves were subject to torture; in the Empire, also free men under criminal charges could be tortured. Valerius Maximus, in his *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*, viii, 4, 1-3, relates three interesting examples of slave-torture. In the first example, a slave who was charged with murder, was put upon the rack. He confessed his guilt, and was executed. A short time later, the man who was supposed to have been murdered, returned to his home safe and sound. In the second example, a slave was suspected of murder. Six times he was subjected to torture, but he stoutly denied complicity in the crime. Nevertheless, the judges rejected his testimony, and condemned him to death. A *triumvir* nailed him to the cross. In the third example, a slave was the principal witness in his master's suit. The former was tortured eight times, but his testimony consistently supported his master's contention of innocence. In spite of this testimony, the master was pronounced guilty. The first example reveals the untrustworthiness of slave-evidence. The second and third examples indicate that Roman law had little confidence in the testimony extracted by torture.

The foregoing Roman examples may shed some light on the Greek situation. After all, a slave was a slave, whether he resided in Athens or Rome. Chorographic differences would hardly bring about a radical change in the nature, disposition and character of the slave-population. Valerius Maximus has recorded one outstanding example of the unreliableness of slave-evidence; he has preserved two examples of Roman distrust of such evidence. Greek slaves were no more trustworthy than their Roman counterparts; Greek courts, though large and motley, were no more gullible than Roman judges. Isaeus, Isocrates and Demosthenes cannot be accepted at face value, when they attach paramount importance to the testimony of slaves. They were doubtless speaking with tongue in cheek.

ALFRED P. DORJAHN

Northwestern University

REINCARNATION

IN THAT ADMIRABLE work, *The Greeks and the Irrational*,¹ the author, E. R. Dodds, breaks a lance at one point with Martin P. Nilsson on the question of reincarnation. The latter has alleged that the doctrine of rebirth is the outcome of "pure logic" and invented by the Greeks, who possessed to an eminent degree this quality of mind.² Dodds objects: "I doubt, however, if religious beliefs are often adopted, even by philosophers, on grounds of pure logic . . . And this particular belief has found favour with many peoples who are by no means born logicians."³ He cites, in footnotes, passages from J. G. Frazer⁴ and Paul Radin⁵ bearing on the beliefs of savages and the semi-barbaric on the question of reincarnation. He goes no further.

Professor Dodds may be accused here of saying too much and too little. The points of view are really very widely sundered. The Greek logician finds the source from which human souls are taken to fulfil the purposes of metempsychosis in the great reservoir of Hades. The primitive man, in many if not all instances, is led to discover the origin of the reborn much nearer home. And the processes are intrinsically different.

An important discovery made through recent anthropological investigations reveals the underlying purpose of the tendance of the dead in primitive societies. The belief long held that its cardinal intention was to ensure to the dead a certain degree of comfort and satisfaction as they lay semi-conscious in the grave has been replaced, in large measure, by a new doctrine, the truth of which rests not upon speculation but the results of patient interrogation. The savage ultimately declares that the family or clan provides the deceased with the accommodation of tomb-furniture and the luxury of food and drink offerings with a view to procuring his speedy rebirth; in other words, to hasten the process of reincarnation.⁶

I have little doubt that this widespread belief in the return to earth of the dead is founded on the familiar phenomenon of recurring family resemblances. The old people

of the tribe declare that the young child is the living image of his grandparent or perhaps great uncle. As the youth develops, many personal traits likewise make their appearance. Presently confidence develops that the child and the ancestor, direct or indirect, are one and the same. Once this principle has established itself within the tribe, the natural admiration that undeveloped peoples entertain for their deceased forbears gives birth to a strong desire to encourage the soul of the preceding generation to seek reincarnation as speedily as may be. The fostering process of tendance is apparently the proper means of accomplishing this desire.

The inconsistent mind of uncivilized man is not staggered by a more or less obvious consideration, which tends to upset his chief premise: the child is as likely as not to resemble father or uncle, who are still living beings and whose souls are solidly contained within their earthly tabernacles.

A. D. FRASER

University of Virginia

NOTES

¹ *Sather Classical Lectures* (University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1951).

² *Eranos*, xxxix (1941), 12.

³ *Op. cit.*, 150.

⁴ *The Belief in Immortality and the Worship of the Dead* (London, 1913-1924), 1, 29.

⁵ *Primitive Religion* (New York, 1941), 270.

⁶ See R. Karstén, *The Civilization of the South American Indians* (London, 1926), 416; E. J. Krige, *Social System of the Zulus* (London, 1936), 74; George Thomson, *Studies in Ancient Greek Society* (London, 1949), 46-48; A. C. Hollis, *The Masai, their Language and Folklore* (Oxford, 1905), 305. A reminiscence of the institution survives in the custom—observed principally in Scotland—of naming sons after their grandfathers.

ILIAS LATINA 7

IT HAS BEEN agreed by most modern editors of the lowly *Latin Iliad* that the seventh verse should begin with the letter U in order that the acrostics of the poem might read ITALICUS, the generally accepted name of the author. As recently as 1935 Hosius (*Gesch. der Röm. Lit.* II, 508) indicated that no good conjecture had as yet been found to restore the text. The passage (vv. 6-8) as

printed by Vollmer in the latest edition (Teubner, 1913) reads:

Confiabat enim summi sententia regis,
 †Protulerant ex quo discordia pectora turbas,
 Sceptringer Atrides et bello clarus Achilles.

The proposals to begin the line with *Ver-sarant* (Döring), *Voluerunt* (Havet), and *Ut primum tulerant* (Baehrens) appear to be unsatisfactory.

I submit that the key to the problem is to be found in one of the basic manuscripts (Brit. Mus. 20 963, saec. xii-xiii) of Vollmer's edition. Line seven of this manuscript reads:

Ex quo pertulerant discordia pectora pugnas.

A glance at the corresponding passage in Homer (A 5-7), reveals *ex quo* to be a rendering of ἐξ οὗ. Its initial position is certainly more logical and in keeping with the Homeric line. I would suggest, therefore, that Italicus himself may have written *Unde et*. *Unde* conveys the same meaning as both *ex quo* and ἐξ οὗ, and the addition of *et* might be an attempt to translate the particle δὲ. Possibly the scribe of the archetype, unaware of the acrostics, but knowing his Homer well, may have been dissatisfied with *unde et* and written *ex quo* as being more faithful to Homer. Whatever the source of the corruption, the substitution of *Unde et* at the beginning of the line is metrically admissible, preserves the meaning, and restores the acrostic.

NATHAN DANE II

Bowdoin College

THE SOURCE OF VISHINSKY'S MOUSE

WHEN MR. VISHINSKY recently expressed his scorn for Western disarmament proposals by stating that a mountain had given birth to a mouse, the Western world quite generally assumed that the source of his allusion was Horace, A. P. 139.¹ This writer has thus far been unable to secure a verbatim report of the speech of Mr. Vishinsky or to find any press reports which reveal whether the Soviet Foreign Minister himself designated Horace as the source of his re-

mark. Unless Mr. Vishinsky or one of his aids, however, made specific reference to Horace, there seems good reason for believing that Aesop rather than Horace should be accredited as the source. References to Horace in current Soviet literature are extremely rare, but the opposite is true of the fables of Aesop. The Soviet leaders are very fond of employing the fables for propaganda purposes,² and apparently many of them study the fables very carefully, either in translations or in adaptations such as those of Krylov, in order to have them on tap when an occasion for their use arises. Hence, since the story of the mountain and the mouse is to be found in various forms in many of the collections of Aesop's fables, it seems that Mr. Vishinsky was, in this instance, simply following a well established Russian practice of alluding to a fable to emphasize a point he was trying to make.

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH

St. Louis University

NOTES

¹ Cf. John F. Latimer, "We See by the Papers," C. J. XLVII (1951), 126.

² Cf. my "Aesop in Propaganda," C. O. XXVIII (1951), 73-75.

CLEANTHES IN THE CORRESPONDENCE OF ADAMS AND JEFFERSON

IN THESE DAYS when the classical tradition in America is in an uphill fight against the gods of the technological era, a perusal of the correspondence between Jefferson and John Adams recalls an age when the leading statesmen of this country found enough time and interest to discuss that masterpiece of Stoic religious poetry, Cleanthes' *Hymn on Zeus*. On September 22, 1813 Adams wrote to Jefferson: "If I did not know it would be sending coal to Newcastle, I would, with all my dimness of eyes and trembling of fingers, copy in Greek the hymn of Cleanthes and request you to compare it with anything of Moses, of David, of Solomon. Instead of those ardent oriental figures which are so difficult to understand, we find that divine simplicity which constitutes the charm of Greek elo-

quence in prose and verse." He then quotes the first lines, in Greek and in English, and continues: "Is the existence, the omnipotence, the eternity, the alpha and omega, and the universal providence of One Supreme Being governing by fixed laws, asserted by St. John . . . in clearer or more precise terms?" The following letter, of October 4, goes on with the analysis of the hymn. "Now, is not this the essence of Christian devotion? . . . *Ek sou gar genos esmen*, I presume, is the phrase quoted by St. Paul, when he says to the Athenians: One of your poets hath said: We are all his offspring." And the discussion

ends with a reference to Priestley's *Doctrine of Heathen Philosophy*: "I believe Cleanthes to be as good a Christian as Priestley." Jefferson, in his reply of October 13, appears somewhat sceptical towards Adams' enthusiasm. He sees the presentation of God's majesty in the Psalms superior to that in Cleanthes' *Hymn*; but even so he adds: "I acknowledge all the merit of the hymn of Cleanthes to Jupiter, which you ascribe to it. It is as highly sublime as a chaste and correct imagination can permit itself to go."

F. M. WASSERMANN

Kansas Wesleyan University

Carthage and Its People

ALONG TIME AGO I read somewhere that if Carthage had been successful in its contest with Rome, civilization would have received a serious setback. Since then I have always been interested in trying to determine whether or not that judgment seemed to be prejudiced.

What we know about the Carthaginians is based on what others have said about them; we have almost nothing written by the people themselves. It seems that the destruction of the city, which the Romans desired to be so thorough, was well-nigh complete in this respect also. In fact one writer is so pessimistic as to say that "we cannot hope that any discoveries . . . will do more than throw a few scattered lights upon that imperial city which—all but unknown to us during five centuries of her growth and her true grandeur—blazes forth into the light of day only in that century which witnessed her heroic struggles and her fall."¹

It seems that Virgil's story about the origin of Carthage is correct to the extent that it was settled, perhaps in the ninth century, by colonists from Tyre or other Phoenician cities.² It is certain that the people were Phoenicians, and they had the characteristics of these rovers of the sea. At first Carthage was merely one of the many outposts that dotted the coasts of the great inland sea. It is said that long before the Greeks

had come into Asia Minor or Italy there were already Phoenician settlements in Asia Minor, in Greece itself, in Africa, in Spain, and on most of the islands of the Mediterranean.

Some early references to the people of Carthage, or rather, to their ancestors, are found in the Bible. Tyre is spoken of as a "strong city"³ in the time of Joshua, as a "stronghold"⁴ in the time of Samuel, and as a city "whose antiquity is of ancient days."⁵ During the latter part of the tenth century Jezebel, the ambitious daughter of a Phoenician king, almost succeeded in establishing the worship of her country's god, Baal, as the state religion in the Kingdom of Israel.⁶ It appears that she was lending support, at state expense, to some eight hundred fifty "prophets of Baal and of the groves." The prophets Isaiah and Ezekiel represent the inhabitants of Tyre and Sidon as traders who travel afar, who handle all manner of merchandise, and who are extremely powerful. They are called "princes" who are the "honorable of the earth,"⁷ people that are "strong in the sea," and that "cause their terror to be on all them that haunt it."⁸ When their power is to be destroyed "all the princes of the sea shall come down from their thrones, and lay away their robes, and put off their broidered garments: they shall clothe themselves with trembling; they shall sit upon the

ground, and shall tremble at every moment, and be astonished at thee."⁹ The whole Mediterranean world is to be deeply moved by the event. It is interesting to notice the articles of trade mentioned by Ezekiel in chapter twenty-seven: silver, iron, tin, lead, slaves, brass, horses, mules, ivory, ebony, emeralds, purple, brodered work, linen, coral, agate, wheat, honey, oil, balm, wine, wool, bright iron, cassia, calamus, lambs, rams, goats, spices, precious stones, gold, and cedar chests. This would seem to include practically all the products of the world of that day. Their commerce made them immensely prosperous, so that they "heaped up silver as the dust, and fine gold as the mire of the streets."¹⁰ Joel complains of their slave-trading when he says "the children also of Judah and the children of Jerusalem have ye sold unto the Grecians, that ye might remove them far from their border."¹¹ And Amos reproves them because they "remembered not the brotherly covenant."¹² How a Roman would have appreciated that!

Such were the people who, as was said before, settled in northern Africa at a place known to them as Kirjath but to the Romans as Carthage. Being of Semitic stock, they had also an eastern culture. Although not much is known about them between the ninth and the sixth centuries, they carried on the Phoenician tradition of commerce. They went as far as Britain for tin, into the interior of Africa for slaves, ivory, gold, and precious stones, and Hanno is said to have explored as far as the equator.¹³ Their settlements dotted the coasts of western Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, Malta, the Balearic Islands, Spain, and perhaps the Canary Islands. A writer even suggests that "in the marts of Carthage and at the tables of her merchant princes rumors may have been heard of a new world beyond the western ocean."¹⁴

Early in the sixth century some powerful Phoenician families had come to Carthage because they had been driven out of Tyre by Assyrian invaders.¹⁵ At about this time Carthage began to close African and Spanish waters to Greek traders, since the decline of the Phoenician and Athenian navies had left

her practically without a maritime rival; the western Mediterranean became almost a Carthaginian lake. She made a treaty of close cooperation with the Etruscans, which was designed to curb the activity of the Greeks of Magna Graecia especially. Polybius says¹⁶ that at about the time that Rome drove out the Etruscan kings, Carthage and Rome made a treaty, the terms of which indicate that the former must have been by far the more important commercial and political state; she evidently dictated the treaty and imposed it on the younger state. There is no record of any further treaty until the fourth century, when the Roman democracy was showing signs of virile growth. This is about the time when a Roman colony was planted at Ostia. Again the terms gave Carthage most of the advantages; Punic traders are given access to all the markets of Latium, but, if there were Roman merchants, they were excluded from three fourths of the Carthaginian domain.¹⁷ W. C. Greene mentions another treaty made under the pressure of the Samnite Wars in 306. This excluded the Romans from the harbors of Sicily and the Carthaginians from Italian ports. During the invasion of Pyrrhus (282-275) the two powers made an alliance against the common enemy; but after his defeat both must have been convinced that their interests in the Mediterranean were bound to conflict.

The people of Carthage appear to have had the commercial and colonizing abilities of the mother city, but in addition they had a "capacity for empire which Tyre never had . . . and they entered upon that vigorous and aggressive policy which was one day to make the western Mediterranean a Carthaginian lake."¹⁸ In Sicily they had early established themselves on the western coast, and they made strong efforts to dislodge the Greeks from the entire island. At the time that Xerxes invaded Greece in 480, a large Carthaginian army under Hamilcar was beaten back at the battle of Himera. Again in 410 and during the reign of Dionysius of Syracuse there were frequent encounters in which victory was sometimes with the one and sometimes with the other. Following 310 the

Syracusan tyrant Agathocles carried the war to Africa and remained there for three years. He thus "probed the weakness of the Carthaginian empire to the very bottom, and mightier men than he, and a mightier people than the Greeks of Sicily, were, all too soon, to follow in his footsteps."¹⁹ The traditional disunity of the Greeks, however, caused them to fail to dislodge the Semitic power from the western part of Sicily, although Syracuse in the southeast and Messina in the northeast seem to have maintained a precarious independence. They had "amply sufficient man-power to cope with foreign rivals, but frittered it away in spasmodic and disunited action."²⁰

As Rome expanded to the southern limits of the Italian peninsula, it was inevitable that the interests of the two most powerful western nations should come into conflict. An "incident" was provided by the appeal of the Mamertines in Messina for Roman assistance. This touched off a war between the strongest sea power the world had perhaps ever seen up to that time and a growing, virile land power. The main facts of the three Punic wars are well known. It is, however, difficult to understand how a nation with no genius for trade nor for the sea, with perhaps no real navy at all, could not only successfully engage a great maritime nation but could actually defeat it in its own element. There must have been differences in the character of the people or in their organization, perhaps in both.

The government of Carthage was a mixture of monarchical, oligarchical, and democratic elements. Aristotle praises it even though he admits that from very early times the oligarchical element predominated.²¹ He says that the oligarchy must have been moderate and beneficial in the use of its power since its rule was never seriously threatened either by a despot from above or by the masses from below. He was, however, not speaking of the Carthage that we know best, but of an earlier one. At the head of the government were two magistrates known as suffetes. Next there was a senate of twenty-eight members (some say these were selected

from a larger body of about three hundred), presided over by the suffetes. It could declare war, levy troops, appoint generals, and send out colonies. If the suffetes and the senate agreed, the decision was final; if not, the decision was referred to the people. At the time of the Punic Wars the power of the suffetes was mostly nominal, and that of the senate had gradually come into the hands of another body called "The Hundred," said to have been set up in the fifth century. They were men of the wealthy class who were chosen by the people after a fashion, but when they had been chosen they were responsible to no one, and vacancies could be filled from among themselves.²² Originally they formed a kind of court for the trial of magistrates, but "they gradually assumed wider functions and in the later days of Carthage they seem to have generally controlled the government."²³ They were wealthy merchants who controlled the vast resources of the state.

The ordinary citizens formed a kind of assembly, and below them must have been a large body of non-citizens, made up of aliens, freedmen, and slaves. Whatever few matters came before the assembly of citizens had been carefully prepared beforehand by the members of the senate. Although technically the assembly had to make the decision whenever the suffetes and the senate could not agree, it is never known to have controlled the government. A rather passive attitude on the part of the mass of the people might not be unusual. Trade seems to have made the city extremely prosperous. The people were well fed, and hence easily governed. Any adventurous, discontented element would very likely be drained off to one of the many colonies that were continually being established. Besides, a large body of citizens was, no doubt, usually on the move, engaged in the vast sea commerce. Such can not have had a very keen interest in politics. However, what may be most revealing is a matter that is mentioned by several historians; it is that the "power of money was the most permanent influence at Carthage."²⁴ Since the political system permitted reelection to office and also

allowed a man to hold several offices at one time,²⁵ the power of bribery must have been a potent one. As long as wealth kept coming in—and we do not read of any serious reverses to the city's commercial expansion until she met Rome—the ruling class would not be likely to have too much difficulty in keeping the government in their hands.

However, when the test for Carthage came, the warning of Amos to the Israelites might have been spoken there too: "Woe to them that are at ease in Zion."²⁶ The weaknesses of organization and of character soon became apparent. Carthage had no citizen soldiers such as fought for Rome. She had for the most part been able to buy her safety by hiring mercenaries from people over whom she exercised some measure of control, or even from completely foreign nations. As long as these were well paid they would fight the battles of their Punic overlords. But when the sources of wealth became curtailed it became increasingly difficult for the government at home to keep efficient armies in the field. These financial straits would soon be magnified by what seems to have been an inherent character fault, one that is mentioned by many writers—Punic perfidy. One reads again and again of instances when mercenary troops were cruelly treated or simply abandoned to their fate, if it seemed opportune to do so. An instance of such cruelty and perfidy is said to have occurred after the First Punic War. Hamilcar had left his troops in charge of a popular deputy commander at Lilybaeum to be transported home. The commander sent the men home in groups so that the government might pay them off and send them away without having a dangerously large military force in the city at one time. Instead of paying the men, the leaders at home kept the soldiers in the city and treated them royally, hoping the men would agree to remit part of their pay. This the mercenaries refused to do, and soon there was a serious mutiny. Order was partially restored and the soldiers were sent one hundred miles from the city. Then one of the suffetes went out to try to settle the claims, but he only made matters worse. Finally the favorite

commander of the men was sent with full authority to deal with the revolting army. Things had by this time gone so far that he and his staff were put into chains and the revolt spread through Libya. After three years of hard fighting Hamilcar finally gained control and is said to have trapped 40,000 men in a mountain defile and to have killed them to a man.²⁷

That the Carthaginians were a cruel Asiatic race seems to be well established, in spite of the fact that their "press agents" have been almost entirely either potentially unfriendly or hostile. We read that "if trading ships of other peoples came within her maritime domain, their crews were promptly thrown overboard."²⁸ "They ground their subject communities with oppressive taxes and gave them no hope of ever obtaining equality of rights."²⁹ Their religion exhibited cruelty and sensuality, being similar to the worship of Baal, about which so much is said in the Bible. That human sacrifice was practiced is evident from references in literature, and that even as late as the time when Carthage was subject to Rome.³⁰ Besides, the testimony of archaeology points in the same direction. In 1925 some eleven hundred urns were taken from what is called the Temple of Tanit, and "we may believe that the majority will be found to contain the charred bones of young children, in many instances accompanied by objects associated with childhood, such as small rings, bracelets, earrings, beads, and amulets. . . . Charred bones of lambs and kids are also found."³¹ B. K. De Prorok claims to have found a stele representing a priest holding a child prior to sacrifice.³² The stone had this inscription: "Whoever overthrows this stone shall be shattered by Baal." He also says that around the altars were babies' bottles and toys, and many lamps—testimony, in his opinion, to nocturnal orgies at the feasts of the divinity.

The Carthaginians seem to have made no contribution at all to the intellectual or moral riches of mankind. No important work in lit-

(Concluded on page 204)

THE REVIEW CUPBOARD

Et summis admiratio
veneratioque et
inferioribus merita
laus

By Grundy Steiner

ANCIENT HISTORY is well represented among the books arriving at this office. Quite apart from the monumental works like Broughton's *Magistrates* and Magie's *Roman Rule* and others which must be farmed out for review at some length, a substantial number, largely textbooks or discussions of special points which receive usually a sentence or a paragraph in general histories, are susceptible of briefer mention. Almost a dozen of these, some of which arrived as this column was almost in its final form, are considered here.

Robinson and Starr offer school texts for undergraduates, Grant and Charlesworth write for the layman who wants to learn more about ancient history by reading at home. Robinson attempts to cover the most ground; the other three limit their subject matter according to various principles of selection.

The revised editions of Bury and Tarn have been prepared by special mechanical procedures. "Unwelcome restrictions," says Mr. Meiggs; "Not what I would, but what I could," says Mr. Tarn. It is to be hoped that other revisers will not likewise be too closely limited by the re-use of old plates.

Alföldi, Mazzarino, and Wirzubski write on special fields and topics (as does Tarn). Of the translations from Aristides and Livy, the former is appropriately noticed for Starr, Charlesworth, Grant, and Wirzubski all have occasion to cite the original here translated, usually to illustrate the profound security felt by the citizens of the Empire.

GENERAL HISTORY

Ancient History: From Prehistoric Times to the Death of Justinian. By C. A. ROBINSON, JR. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951. Pp. xxiii, 738. \$6.00.

THIS TEXTBOOK is adorned with 138 informative illustrations and some 83 maps and diagrams drawn mostly by Dr. Erwin Raisz of the Institute of Geographical Exploration, Harvard University. The maps are functional and clear, although the use of colors might occasionally have

pointed up certain distinctions.

The order of topics is chronological by regions: Part I "History and Prehistory," Part II "The Ancient Near East," Part III "Hellas," Part IV "The Hellenistic Age," Part V "The Roman Republic," and Part VI "The Roman Empire." The basic pattern seems to be a narrative of events followed by a description of cultural developments (e.g. a chapter on the Peloponnesian War followed by one on the Periclean Age). The accounts of the Persian and especially of the Peloponnesian wars are heavily interlarded with quotations from Herodotus and Thucydides respectively. To let these ancient authorities thus speak in their own words (albeit translated and abbreviated) is rather like introducing guest lecturers to speak on their fields of specialization and might have been exploited further.

This is a textbook for undergraduates and as such it must be judged. It therefore invokes comparison with its contemporary, J. W. Swain's *The Ancient World* (New York: Harpers, 1950). Robinson generally presents (and seems to accept) what may be called "the received version of things" in brief, digested form. Swain (who is more skeptical and has 500 additional pages) likes to let his reader know of research problems which arise in connection with the events recounted. This is important for there are two sources of joy and satisfaction about history: (1) the facts (which may be romantic, interesting, or even important) and (2) the process of recovering the facts (which can be just as difficult and just as intriguing to master as that of splitting the atom—and possibly much less destructive). One example will have to illustrate some of the differences. Of Marathon Robinson (pp. 198-199) says, "The westward advance of the Asiatic empire was halted, and the Greeks were inspired with a fair hope of maintaining their freedom. . . . The glory of the Marathonian warriors never faded." Swain (1,379) first mentions the growth of legends about the battle in antiquity (noting, e.g., that the first reference to the Marathon runner comes 600 years later). In the realm of modern "legends" he does not regard Marathon as an essential turning point in history, since

while the Persians failed in this attempt, they did secure their European bridgehead ten years later: "Had the Persians won at Marathon, they would soon have been defeated somewhere else [as they were after burning Athens]. The Greeks were too strong, too devoted to liberty, and too far away, ever to be subjugated by Persian kings."

Anyone choosing a new text in ancient history will need to consider both. Robinson's text is more concise. It will, however, certainly leave the mature student asking for much, much more information (although there is a helpful bibliographical appendix which suggests a good range of collateral reading) and will fail to suggest many of the by-paths of investigation which the other book brings to mind. But one cannot tell everything in 700 pages.

Two final points: Not all Romans had *cognomina* despite the note on p. 449. To indicate the accents for Classical names listed in the index is no doubt a wisely practical concession to the ignorance of undergraduates.

Ancient History. By MICHAEL GRANT. (Home Study Books, No. 15.) London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1952. Pp. viii, 247. 7s. 6d.

A VERY DIFFERENT book despite the similar title. The author samples even more territory (geographically) and yet by restricting his themes actually treats many fewer topics. The first four chapters ("Part I: Selection in Ancient History") are devoted to narrowing the range of possible topics to the one which is elaborated in "Part II: The Causes of Ancient Wars."

Chapter 1 is an essay on the principles to be followed by the general historian: if his history history is to possess utility he must (1) choose general themes and tendencies but (2) only those worth stressing for his own day and age—e.g. for 1951, the problem of war and peace (i.e. political unity). Chapter 2 outlines the ancient history of five regions (India, China, America, Western Asia, and the Mediterranean area). Chapter 3 sketches Greek and Roman history by topics. Chapter 4 develops the idea that the central theme of ancient history is war and that ancient history provides a remarkable field for the study of why wars have occurred.

The causes of ancient wars are found in international anarchy (Chapter 5), in aggressive (including religious and racialist) nationalism (Chapter 6), in the social structure (Chapter 7), and finally, as an outgrowth of social stratification, in badly chosen officials (Chapter 8). Counter forces like federations, pan-Hellenism, imperial uni-

versalism, etc., are discussed in the appropriate chapters.

This is a well unified book. The choice of theme, being subjective, is open to attack, but the "home student" will get the benefit of an extended interpretation which should provoke thought more effectively than 240 pages of facts and pat generalizations could be expected to do. And Professor Grant has demonstrated, as he intended, how the myriad data of general history can be compressed and a selection made according to pre-established principles.

This, of course, should be an ephemeral sort of history. Any solution (for good or ill) of the basic problem—"Whether . . . human beings . . . can avoid destruction" (p. 19)—or any diversion of our civilization towards any other problem at any moment would make this specific interpretation outmoded. The method, however, could survive, and that is tribute enough.

A few details are objectionable. Some of the linguistic classifications in the early chapters are open to question. The home student gets no selective bibliography. In fact he gets no bibliography at all, and opinions and quotations from authorities are attributed only by the name of the author. If it is at all important that the reader be told (p. 154) it was H. Freyer who said, "the frontier—even if unintentionally—creates the enemy," it is probably important that the reader be told the book and the page as well.

GREEK HISTORY

A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great. By J. B. BURY. 3rd ed., revised by RUSSELL MEIGGS. London: Macmillan and Co., 1951. Pp. xxv, 925.

BURY's *History*, after twenty-two printings of the first two editions, appears now in a revised third edition. As Mr. Meiggs explains in his preface (pp. v-vi), besides some new illustrations the changes are the following:

... while the section on early Crete has been left substantially unchanged, the Greek sections of the first chapter have been again re-written, incorporating where possible Bury's material in a revised setting. The accumulation of new evidence . . . and the further sifting of old evidence has also demanded widespread revision in the other chapters.

For technical reasons the plates of the book have been altered only where changes were necessary. . . . Passages that have been re-written to introduce new material are enclosed in square brackets.

The notes have been largely recast. . . . to-day's reader is well provided with guides: the bibliographies

in the Cambridge Ancient History . . . and in other works, justify economy in references to modern works. The emphasis in the new notes has therefore been concentrated on the ancient sources . . .

. . . I have tried to preserve the individual character of Bury's work and particularly to make no change in the scale or emphasis of his History.

Chapter 6, "The Advance of Persia to the Aegean," illustrates the revision. There are apparently only six changes in 46 pages. Four comprise but a single sentence. One is a condensation of a longer passage. Only one (pp. 255-256) runs to any length (two paragraphs, the second an insertion based on archeological material). Archeological and numismatic evidence underlie three of the six.

The notes, by contrast, have been widely altered and greatly expanded, largely (despite the reviser's claim to the contrary) by the incorporation of references to recent critical literature. For Chapter 6, again, there were twenty-nine notes in the second edition. Fifteen survive relatively unchanged; seven have been replaced; and twelve new have been added.

Bury's History has long been respected and useful. Mr. Meigg's changes seem judicious and well done within the strict mechanical limitations imposed. A new generation of students can now approach the book with the confidence that it has been "brought up to date."

The Greeks in Bactria and India. By W. W. TARN. 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1952. Pp. xxiii, 561. Plates and Maps. \$9.50.

EXCEPT FOR a second preface (on p. xii), twenty-two pages of *addenda* (pp. 521-542), and a few required changes in the table of contents, this is an outright reprint of the first edition.

The *addenda* are essentially the author's later commentary upon his own work. There are some corrections and modifications, a measure of supplementary evidence, and references both to the literature (from 1938 to 1950) and to developments and changes in Tarn's own interpretations as elaborated in his *Alexander* and elsewhere.

This method of revision, apparently prompted by insufficient access to libraries to allow Tarn to prepare a full revision (p. xii), has both advantages and disadvantages. Errors, misinterpretations and outdated conclusions should not stand as they do without any indication that they are altered elsewhere in the book. But to have the *addenda* printed in one section makes it easy to determine what the author has changed and what

he feels may sometime need to be modified.

The changes in the matter of this valuable book are satisfactory. It is regrettable that circumstances blocked a proper revision. All who use the second edition should consult the *addenda* first, for the index is merely a reprint and so does not include the new material.

ROMAN HISTORY

The Emergence of Rome As Ruler of the Western World. By CHESTER G. STARR, JR. ("The Development of Western Civilization: Narrative Essays in the History of Our Tradition . . .," edited by Edward W. Fox.) Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1950. Pp. ix, 145. \$1.00.

THIS IS THE FIRST in a series of "narrative essays . . . undertaken in an effort to provide . . . a text for the introductory history survey course offered in the College of Arts and Sciences of Cornell University" (p. v). Professor Starr (who carries his account from the invasion by the Mediterranean type people to A.D. 180) sketches how the name "Rome" came first to signify a dominant city-state; then, under Augustus, all Italy; and how finally it came to equal the entire Mediterranean world (p. 93), "an area larger in point of relative time than all the world today."

The essay is clear, concise, and readable. It should be an effective vehicle for getting the student to remember essential facts and principles. It seems a bit glib in its summaries of matters about which many a learned man has sweated long in an effort to reconstruct the facts from slight evidence, but this is undoubtedly to avoid scaring the freshman. For the same reason a minimum number of proper names appears in the narrative.

There are suggestions for further reading, a chronological summary, and an index. Starr has carried out his assignment well, within the limits set ("basic reading for one week in a semester course") and has set a sound standard for other texts in the series.

The Roman Empire. By M. P. CHARLESWORTH. (The Home University Library of Modern Knowledge, no. 219.) London: Oxford University Press, 1951. Pp. 8 unnn., 225. \$2.00.

MR. STARR had prepared a lucid outline stripped of most details which might obscure that outline. Mr. Charlesworth, by contrast, offers a substantial number of details, often by quotation or paraphrase from ancient sources, to illustrate (as he suggests in his preface) "the life

and work, . . . the thought and conditions, that existed during the first three centuries of that great experiment in government which men term the Roman Empire." This technique is effective, too.

The author does not attempt a consecutive historical account, but rather presents chapters which are essays on various subjects, e.g. "The Emperor: His Person, His Position, His Helpers," "Defence: Army and Navy," "State Religion and Private Religion. Magic. Christianity," etc. The chapter on the emperor is one of the neatest.

A bibliography of general histories of Rome and works (nearly all in English) on special periods and topics follows. There is a brief index.

A Conflict of Ideas in the Late Roman Empire: The Clash between the Senate and Valentinian I. By ANDREW ALFÖLDI. Translated by HAROLD MATTINGLY. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952. Pp. vii, 151. \$3.75.

ALFÖLDI'S THESIS (p. 47) is stated in the words of St. Jerome (*Chron.* a. 2381): "that 'Valentinian, in general, was an outstanding Emperor, in his moral tone resembling Aurelian—only some explained his excessive severity as cruelty and his economy as greed.'"

Chapter 1 is devoted to a strong defense of Valentinian and criticism of the partiality of Ammianus Marcellinus. Chapter 2 recounts the substitution of Pannonian friends of Valentinian and Valens in a series of key governmental posts; Chapter 3, corruption in late imperial government and efforts to counteract it by terror; Chapter 4, Valentinian's clash with the bitter senatorial opposition. Chapter 5 develops the idea that the writing of imperial history was largely in the hands of adherents to that opposition; that these writers by literary convention stigmatize as ignorant an emperor who was unfriendly to the senate; and that Valentinian who "still had a sufficiently wide outlook and a sufficiently adequate education not to accelerate the decline of culture" (pp. 123-124) has suffered grievously from their defamation. Alföldi presents admittedly strong evidence for a new estimate of Valentinian and suggests compelling reasons for caution in accepting the voice of Ammianus as impartial. (He did not have access to Laister's volume on the greater historians.)

The translation is generally good although here and there a certain wooliness of expression is noticeable. Brief notes appear at the bottoms of pages; the long notes have wisely been relegated to the end of the book. There is an index.

Aspetti Sociali del Quarto Secolo: Ricerche di Storia Tardo-Romana. By SANTO MAZZARINO. (Problemi e Ricerche di Storia Antica, n. 1.) Roma: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 1951. Pp. 441.

THIS UNINDEXED volume is concerned with the interpretation of the *de rebus bellicis* and of the *Historia Augusta*. The chief problems considered are those connected with *adaeratio* and the balance, in the West, between the productive forces devoted to agriculture and the man-power assigned to the defense (p. 46).

Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate. By CH. WIRSZUBSKI. (Cambridge Classical Studies.) New York: Cambridge University Press, 1950. Pp. xi, 182. \$3.00.

A COMPACT, well-documented study of the changing meaning of the term *libertas* in the two hundred years from the Gracchi to Trajan. The conclusion (p. 171) is that whereas *libertas* in the Republic had been regarded as "freedom of the citizen in a free State" with a man's rights protected by constitutional safeguards, under "the Principate the ruling law which had been the basis of *libertas* was in fact replaced by the will of the Princeps" and "the possession of *libertas* became a gift rather than a right."

ΕΙΣ ΡΩΜΗΝ: To Rome. By AELIUS ARISTIDES. Translated with notes and introduction by SAUL LEVIN. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1950. Pp. 31.

THIS is presumably the first translation of *To Rome* to appear in English. The flattery inherent in a piece of this sort is hard on the modern reader's digestion; so this sample is enough, but the translator is obviously quite capable of other, more ambitious, undertakings.

Livy, XXVIII-XXX. Translated by FRANK GARDNER MOORE. Vol. 8. (Loeb Classical Library.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949. Pp. xi, 562. 9 maps. \$3.00.

THE EVENTS of the years B.C. 207-201 are recounted here. The text and translation of the three books and the *Periochae* are followed by a brief appendix, "The Zama Problem" (concerning the location and date of the battle), an index of names, and the folding maps which are based chiefly upon those in the *Cambridge Ancient History*. The appearance of this volume, a fit companion to its predecessors, leaves only the final two which are needed to complete the translation of Livy.

BOOK REVIEWS

City-State and World State in Greek and Roman Political Theory until Augustus. By MASON HAMMOND. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1951. Pp. x, 217. \$4.00.)

LOOKED AT from one point of view this book is a contribution to the history of ancient political theory; from another, it is a discussion of reasons for the decline of ancient civilization; and from a third it is a Tract for the Times. Professor Hammond believes that the failure of Rome was due in part to the fact that her political theorists were unable to forget the concept of the city-state and think in terms of universal empire, and he fears that the modern world will suffer Rome's fate unless the unlimited national sovereignty which it now insists upon is replaced by something broader. It must be added, however, that he mentions these larger matters only in passing, and that the greater part of his book is an objective study of ancient political theory.

As the book's chapters were originally delivered as lectures before a popular audience, the author could not assume much knowledge of ancient political and constitutional history, and he had to supply this background material as he went along. In one chapter, therefore, he gives a succinct account of the political institutions of the early Roman Republic, another traces the decline of the Republic from the Gracchi to Cicero, and a third deals with political events during the twenty years between Cicero's consulship and his death. It is, of course, quite impossible to treat such subjects thoroughly in fifteen or twenty pages. All that can be done is to sketch in the broad developments and make a few suggestions as to why things took the course they did. These historical chapters alternate with others discussing the political theorists of the time. One of the latter summarizes the views of Plato and Aristotle about the proper government for a city-state and the merits of a "mixed constitution" combining the good points of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy. Another discusses Polybius' identification of this mixed constitution with that of the Roman Republic. Others analyze Cicero's political writings at length to show how his thought could not escape from the old patterns. The author then emphasizes—too strongly perhaps—Augustus' indebtedness to Cicero.

In an early chapter Hammond quotes with

approval a paragraph from Ernest Barker, distinguishing between "political thought" and "political theory." The former is said to consist of the vague ideas shared by practical politicians about how government works and their solutions of specific problems; the latter makes up an abstract and logical system, the work of professional "thinkers." The author then declares that in all her history Rome produced only three political theorists: Polybius, Cicero, and St. Augustine, and they had no great originality. They merely rewrote Greek theory—with disastrous results. If only Rome had had more and better theorists, able to break away from the old thought patterns and concoct a theory of world empire in harmony with the political realities of the new day, things might have gone better. This is the heart of Hammond's argument. It is possible, however, that he attributes too much importance to theoretical writings. When Augustus was "restoring" the Republic, he occasionally used Ciceronian phrases which he found convenient, perhaps, but his fundamental ideas all came from what Barker called "political thought." Had Cicero, or someone else, dreamed up theoretical foundations for a democratic world-state, would Augustus or anyone else have paid attention to them? Cicero somewhere makes an old Roman senator remark that he found Greek speculations very interesting but that he reserved them for his leisure moments and never allowed them to interfere with his duties as a citizen. Such seems to have been the general attitude of Rome's governing classes toward "political theory."

Hammond's book contains a brief bibliography, and his notes judiciously discuss the theories of several recent writers. He highly esteems Miss Taylor's recent *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar*, as is quite proper, and his opinion of J. Carcopino's *Les Secrets de la Correspondance de Cicéron* is higher than that expressed by various other critics.

J. W. SWAIN

University of Illinois

Prudentius, with an English translation, Vol. I. By H. J. THOMSON. (Loeb Classical Library): London, William Heinemann Ltd.; Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press (1949). Pp. xvii + 401. 15s.; \$3.00.

THIS VOLUME initiates the pair devoted to the poems of the Spanish Christian, Aurelius Pru-

dentius Clemens (born 348, died after 405), and conforms, of course, in all respects, to the familiar pattern and policy of this series, of which it is the 387th title to appear. Following the brief introduction, in which we miss a treatment of the pleasing variety of the poet's versification, comes the short autobiographical *Praefatio*. Then, what seems to the reviewer the best of this volume, the twelve pieces of the *Liber Cathemerinon*, here happily rendered as "The Daily Round," are followed by the hexameters of two theological poems of greater length, the *Apotheosis* or "Divinity of Christ" and the *Hamartigenia* or "Origin of Sin." Next, if one has a taste for allegory, there is the *Psychomachia*, rather unfortunately translated under the curious title of "The Fight for Mansoul" [sic]. The volume concludes with the first of the two books of the *Contra Oratorem Symmachi*, thus separated from its fellow which doubtless will appear in the later volume.

The text followed, though not slavishly, is that of the Swiss, J. Bergman (1926), now standard. The English version, in prose without being prosy except in rare instances (e.g. *Apoth.* 68 of. becomes "It is at diverse times that Siloam disgorges its waters; not always does it emit the stream . . ."), is generally fine in imagery and correct; exceptions: *vagus criminibus* (*Contra Orat. Symm.* 349) is "gadding tresses" and *rapit* in *Cath.* 4.63 does not mean "ravished." For some reason the name of the editor and translator becomes "Thomson" on the title-page and "Thompson," twice, on the jacket; elsewhere I noted but one misprint (undistinguishable, p. 139). These are, of course, few and small blemishes and will not affect the pleasure of the volume. Prudentius was not, of course, a front-rank poet but will repay attention for his echoes of the great Augustans, to say nothing of Juvenal; for the charming imagery and keen observation of the sights and sounds of early mediaeval times; and for his thorough knowledge, drawn as a layman only, from the great sources of orthodox Christianity, not only by the ear but in much reading of the Testaments, Old and New, and of the Apocrypha, as well.

GEORGE E. McCracken

Drake University

Sextus Empiricus: Vol. IV, Against the Professors.

Translated by R. G. Bury. (Loeb Classical Library.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949. Pp. vii, 409. \$3.00.

"Education is the inculcation of the incompre-

hensible into the ignorant by the incompetent," quoth a present-day critic with severely controlled optimism. But a true Sceptic takes a more sweeping and uncompromising view, and Sextus Empiricus demonstrates by triumphant logic that in the domain of the Arts and Sciences, teacher and subject and method and student are all non-existent. If the reviewer had not been too sceptical to find these Sceptical views acceptable, he would have bashfully retreated into non-existence and this review had been irreparably lost to the present generation and posterity.

Sextus Empiricus was a Greek empirical physician whose *floruit* came just after the Age of the Antonines. He was also head of the Sceptic School, and in the latter capacity he undertook to write *Against the Professors*. In this Slaughter of the Innocents he logically and calmly and *seriatim* demolishes the professors of languages and literature, the rhetors, the geometers, the arithmeticians, the astrologers, and the music teachers. This done, he dusts off his hands and returns to his pill-concocting. While admiring this deft and drastic operation on the body academic, and while feeling that we can manage to spare the astrologers, we pause a respectful moment to bemoan the early demise of the other professors. Our own partisan sympathies being engaged, we secretly exult that the professors refused to stay logically dead. *Semper sint in flore*.

Sextus was the last Sceptic of any consequence. There was nothing more left to demolish, and the School quietly died out. The Sceptics are gone, and the perversely obstinate professors remain.

It was a considerable achievement for a man about the year 200 to be simultaneously a logician, a physician, and a writer of literary taste and culture. Sextus knew a surprising amount about the subjects which his logic argued out of existence. In the present work he evinced his wide reading by citing or referring to about twenty poets, besides a host of philosophers and other prose-writers. He loved to quote Euripides, who seems to have been his favorite poet after Homer. Occasionally, expert medical knowledge comes to the fore as a source of illustration in a developing argument.

This fourth volume of Bury's translation is an afterthought, for volumes 1-3 were published between 1933 and 1936. The professorial managers of the Loeb Classical Library had no intention of including the treatise *Against the Professors*, but some one has overpersuaded them. Thus we fortunately have in the four volumes a modern printing of all the surviving writings of Sextus,

unfortunately based on the 1842 edition of Bekker. Mutschmann's Teubner edition, a great improvement over Bekker, appeared just before World War I, except that Mutschmann never got out the volume which would have contained *Against the Professors*. Bury has emended Bekker's text at about forty points in this volume, and in addition has adopted many good textual suggestions by Heintz. The text still is susceptible of more improvement. The Loeb editors gave no help, except that Warmington suggested five emendations, none adopted by Bury (but two appear in the translation, which thus doesn't exactly match the text).

Bury handles well the large number of technical terms in grammar and rhetoric as well as in philosophy. But certain errors in the translation of these terms in his earlier volumes are demonstrated in an able article on the logic of Sextus by Benson Mates, *American Journal of Philology* 70 (1949), 290-298. Readers of the Greek should consult the index of technical terms at the end of Bury's third volume. Incidentally, the index of proper names in the fourth volume misses numerous references and omits Ion Tragicus. In the carefully printed book these trifling errors appeared: μέση for μέρη (p. 54, sect. 93), court for courts (p. 209), broad for board (p. 209, sect. 110), and Chadean for Chaldean (p. 359).

CLARENCE A. FORBES

The Ohio State University

HORACE (from page 162)

NOTES

- ¹ *The Art Bulletin*, (Dec. 1940), XXII, no. 4, pp. 197-209.
- ² London, New York, 1949.
- ³ *Ep.* ii. 3. 14-23.
- ⁴ E. H. Haight, *Horace and his Art of Enjoyment*, (New York, 1925), p. 85; see the whole chapter "Life in Rome Through Horace's Eyes," pp. 83-145.
- ⁵ *Sat.* i. 9.
- ⁶ C.S. 9-12.
- ⁷ *Sat.* ii. 2. 101-104.
- ⁸ *Carm.* ii. 15. 13-20; iii. 1. 41-48.
- ⁹ *Sat.* ii. 6. 71.
- ¹⁰ *Carm.* ii. 18; ii. 15. 17-20; 16. 1-12; *Ep.* i. 10. 31-32.
- ¹¹ *Ep.* i. 15. 42-46.
- ¹² *Sat.* ii. 3. 307-313.
- ¹³ *Sat.* ii. 3. 168-186.
- ¹⁴ *Carm.* iii. 24. 25-32.
- ¹⁵ *Carm.* iv. 2. 17-20.
- ¹⁶ *Carm.* iv. 8.

- ¹⁷ *Sat.* i. 4. 21-22. See H. L. Fairclough, *Horace, Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica in The Loeb Classical Library* (G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1926), pp. 50-51; A. Kiessling and R. Heinze (hereafter referred to as K. H.) *Q. Horatius Flaccus*, (Berlin, 3 vols., 1914, 1917, 1921), ii. p. 73, admit that the meaning of these lines is uncertain.
- ¹⁸ *Sat.* i. 6.
- ¹⁹ *Ep.* ii. 1. 234.
- ²⁰ *Ep.* ii. 1. 231-244.
- ²¹ *Ep.* ii. 1. 264-270. On ancient portraiture, see M. H. Swindler, *Ancient Painting*, (New Haven, 1929), *passim*; E. Strong, *Art in Ancient Rome*, (New York, 1928, 2 vols.) i. 64-72, 106-107. On portraits in wax (not imagines) see K. H., *op. cit.*, iii. 241-242.
- ²² *Rem. Amor.* 723-724.
- ²³ *Her.* xiii. 151-158.
- ²⁴ *Juv.* vii. 237-238.
- ²⁵ *Ep.* ii. 2. 180. See K. H. *op. cit.*, iii. p. 271; E. Strong, *op. cit.*, i. pp. 106-107.
- ²⁶ Pliny XXXIV. 34: signa quoque Tuscanica per terras dispersa, quae quin in Etruria facitata sint non est dubium.
- ²⁷ *Sat.* i. 1. 70-72; *Ep.* i. 2. 51-53.
- ²⁸ *Carm.* i. 5. 13-16; *Ep.* ii. 3. 19-21.
- ²⁹ *Sat.* ii. 1. 30-33.
- ³⁰ On the development of real portraiture, see Swindler, *op. cit.*, pp. 319 ff. and *passim*.
- ³¹ K. H. *op. cit.*, ii. 331, Pliny, XXXV. 124.
- ³² Such posters sketched on walls of houses are abundantly illustrated in the Strada della Abbondanza in Pompeii. M. della Corte, *Pompeii, the New Excavations*, (Valle di Pompeii, 1925).
- ³³ Pliny, iv. 7. 1.
- ³⁴ Pliny, iv. 28. For archaeological comments on these letters see K. Lehmann-Hartleben, *Plinio il giovane, lettere scelte con commento archeologico* (Firenze, 1936), pp. 62-63, 65-66.
- ³⁵ A. Maiuri, *La Casa del Menandro e il suo Tesoro di Argenteria*, (Rome, 1932), Frontispiece.
- ³⁶ *Sat.* i. 4. 27.
- ³⁷ *Sat.* i. 6. 114-118. Campana supellex refers to the bronze ware produced at Capua. See K. H., *op. cit.*, ii. p. 126.
- ³⁸ *Carm.* iv. ii. 6. For illustrations of silverware, see Maiuri, *op. cit.*, Tavole XVI-LXIII.
- ³⁹ *Ep.* i. 5. 1-3. See K. H., *op. cit.*, iii. pp. 48-49 on the use of the word *patella* by Varro and Horace.
- ⁴⁰ *Sat.* ii. 3. 142-144.
- ⁴¹ *Sat.* ii. 8.
- ⁴² *Sat.* ii. 2. 4-7.
- ⁴³ *Sat.* ii. 4. 76-87. *Ep.* i. 5. 21-26. Compare with Horace's directions for neatness the couplets about etiquette painted on the walls of a dining-room at Pompeii, E. H. Haight, *Essays on Ancient Fiction*, (New York, 1936), p. 57.
- ⁴⁴ *Sat.* ii. 2 and 6.
- ⁴⁵ *Sat.* ii. 3. 239-242. For the anecdote see K. H., *op. cit.*, ii. p. 251.
- ⁴⁶ *Sat.* ii. 7. 8-9.
- ⁴⁷ *Sat.* ii. 7. 53-56.

- ⁴⁸ *Carm.* iv. 12. 13-20.
⁴⁹ *Carm.* iv. 13.
⁵⁰ *Ep.* i. 14. 32; *Ep.* i. 1. 94-97.
⁵¹ *Ep.* i. 6. 40-44.
⁵² *Ep.* ii. 1. 200-207.
⁵³ *Ep.* i. 6. 17-18.
⁵⁴ *Ep.* ii. 2. 180-182.
⁵⁵ *Carm.* iii. 24.
⁵⁶ *Ad Fam.* vii. 23; *ad Att.*, xii. 29.
⁵⁷ P. Lejay, *Satires* in F. Plessis et P. Lejay, *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*, (Paris, 1911), p. 386.
⁵⁸ *Sat.* ii. 3. 20-25; translated by H. R. Fairclough, *op. cit.*, in *The Loeb Classical Library*.
⁵⁹ *Sat.* ii. 3. 64-65.
⁶⁰ *Sat.* ii. 7. 95-101.
⁶¹ *Ep.* ii. 1. 232-244; *Carm.* iv. 8. 1-10.
⁶² *Ep.* ii. 1. 93-98, 156.
⁶³ *Ep.* ii. 1. 242.
⁶⁴ *Ep.* ii. 1. 248-250.
⁶⁵ *Carm.* iv. 2. 17-20; *Carm.* iv. 8.
⁶⁶ W. S. Marris, *The Odes of Horace*, (Oxford University Press, 1912), p. 121, *Carm.* iv. 8. 1-8.
⁶⁷ Fairclough, *op. cit.*, p. 449.
⁶⁸ R. Lee, *op. cit.*, pp. 197-269.
⁶⁹ Simonides of Ceos, quoted by Plutarch, *De Gloria Atheniensium*, C. 3.

ATHLETICS (from page 173)

Olympia, and the certainty of swift punishment for an offender who was caught. Under the Empire, Roman law established further sanctions; an edict of Diocletian and Maximian grants exemption from taxes and civic obligations to certain professional athletes who had won victories, provided that they had never corrupted or bribed their opponents.⁶⁰

Law, oaths, rules, vigilant officials, tradition, the fear of flogging, the religious setting of the games, a personal sense of honor—all these contributed to keep Greek athletic contests clean. And most of the thousands of contests over the centuries were clean. Though corruption undoubtedly increased with the growth of professionalism, it was finally Christianity and not corruption that caused the abolition of Greek athletics. The games were a powerful survival of paganism, and entrenched Christianity insisted that they had to go.

NOTES

¹ Paus. 6. 13. 1. Anachronistically Pausanias ascribes the proselytizing to Hiero, who became tyrant of Syracuse only in 478.

² Paus. 6. 2. 6.

³ Paus. 6. 3. 11. Deceived by Pausanias' flat statement was Chester G. Starr, Jr., "Subsidization of Athletes," *Class. Journ.* 31 (1935-36) 444 f. The correct and pertinent facts are given by J. Kirchner, s.v. *Dikon*, *RE* 5. 581.

⁴ *Pind. Ol.* 12; Paus. 6. 4. 11. Ergoteles' Olympic victories were in 472 and 468.

⁵ Paus. 6. 18. 6.

⁶ *Thuc.* 5. 49-50; Paus. 6. 2. 2-3.

⁷ *Plut. Lycurgus* 20.

⁸ Paus. 6. 3. 7.

⁹ Paus. 6. 1. 4-5.

¹⁰ *Plut. de vitioso pudore* 17 (535 C.).

¹¹ Louis Robert, *Hellenica VIII* (Paris, 1950), 88 f. See above, p. 172.

¹² *Gell.* 5. 9. 5-6. Gellius says *non bona fide*, but he does not make clear the exact nature of the sly maneuver. The incident is somewhat differently told by *Val. Max.* 1. 8. Ext. 4.

¹³ Paus. 5. 21. 2-4.

¹⁴ *Ps.-Plut. Decem Orat. Vitae* 850 B.

¹⁵ Paus. 5. 21. 5-7. The affair of Callippus must have been fresh in the mind of Aeschines when, in 330 (*m. Ctes.* 179-180), he spoke of the improbability of getting an Olympic crown by intrigue.

¹⁶ Paus. 5. 21. 8-9.

¹⁷ Paus. 5. 21. 16-17.

¹⁸ Paus. 5. 21. 15.

¹⁹ *IG IV* 1508 = *SIG*³ 1076.

²⁰ *Machon ap. Ath.* 13. 582 B.

²¹ *Philost. Gym.* 45.

²² *Artemidorus Oneirocrit.* 4. 82.

²³ *Plut. Lyc.* 22.

²⁴ *Heraclit. Fr.* 42 *Diels-Kranz*: Homer and Archilochus, poets obnoxious to Heraclitus, ought metaphorically "to be expelled from the games and flogged"; *ps.-Dion. Hal. Ars Rhet.* 7. 6 (flogging, fine, and expulsion); *Dio Chr. Or.* 31.119 (flogging); *Clem. Rom. II Cor.* 7. 4 (flogging and expulsion).

²⁵ *Ps.-Dion. Hal. Ars Rhet.* 7. 6.

²⁶ Paus. 6. 6. 5-6. The MSS. of Pausanias and other writers spell the name Theagenes, but inscriptions give the true spelling Theogenes or (uncontracted) Theogenes.

²⁷ *Epict.* 3. 22. 52, with Oldfather's note in the Loeb translation.

²⁸ Paus. 5. 21. 18.

²⁹ W. W. Hyde, *Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art* (Washington, 1921), 34.

³⁰ Paus. 5. 21. 12-14.

³¹ Louis Robert, *Hellenica VIII* (Paris, 1950), 88 f.

³² *Hdt.* 8. 59.

³³ *Ar. Eq.* 1159-1161.

³⁴ *Plut. Apoph. Lac.* 224 F.

³⁵ *Julian Or.* 2. 69 D.

³⁶ *Chrysippus Fr.* 689 (SVF), from *Cic. Off.* 3. 12.42; *Lucian Calumnia* 12.

³⁷ *IG II*² 956.

³⁸ *Stat. Theb.* 6. 550-645, esp. 615-617.

³⁸ Verg. Aen. 9. 219-361, esp. 335-338.

³⁹ An opponent of Sogenes overstepped in Pindar's *Seventh Nemean Ode* (70-74). See the interpretation of the passage by Richmond Lattimore, CP 40 (1945) 121 f.; also E. N. Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals* (London, 1910), 356.

⁴⁰ Plut. Alcib. 2. 2 f. A similar anecdote in Plutarch about a Spartan wrestler: *Apoph. Lac.* 234 D. Biting was everywhere forbidden to wrestlers, and was allowed to pancratiasts only at Sparta.

⁴¹ Gardiner *op. cit.*, 443, fig. 158; CVA 5¹ Brit. Mus.

III H. f., Pl. 4. 3 b

⁴² POxy. VIII 1083, fr. 1, vss. 9-11.

⁴³ Lucian *Demonax* 49.

⁴⁴ Gardiner *op. cit.*, 436 f., figs. 151-152.

⁴⁵ Epict. 3. 15. 4.

⁴⁶ II Tim. 2. 5.

⁴⁷ E. N. Gardiner, *Athletics of the Ancient World* (Oxford, 1930), 33.

⁴⁸ Paus. 5. 24. 9 f.

⁴⁹ Cod. Iust. 10. 54.

with the knowledge and horror of deeds she dare not breathe sickens in its remorseful isolation. There is no help for her, and the laments of her waiting women precede Sexton's announcement, "The queen, my lord, is dead" and the heart-rending lines, "She should have died hereafter. There would have been a time for such a word." Lady Macbeth who could have endured spiritual and physical uneasiness forever had Macbeth merited her faith dies because her faith in Macbeth weakened and consequently her faith in herself. Her discovery and forced acceptance of the innate moral rot in the character of Macbeth destroys her. She dies isolated by her crimes and her guilt; Antigone dies isolated by an almost superhuman sense of justice and right.

MACBETH (from page 177)

but that she concurs instantly with whatever Macbeth may propose.

The play hastens into the magnificent banquet scene. The dignitaries of the realm gather to pay "lip homage" to the king and queen. Macbeth's tragic statement, "The table's full," is a definite shock to his wife. For a few minutes she is unable to absorb the full meaning of his statement. Her finer sensibilities have refused to accept without reservation the knowledge that once she and Macbeth have put their hands to the plough they cannot turn back. At the close of the scene the two stand each in his own sphere, separated by their joint guilt. She is no longer able to encourage him. He is no longer able to ask it. His "I am in blood" expresses his inability to change his tactics. Lady Macbeth's commonplace "You lack the season of all natures, sleep" is the ironic acme of futility and despair and aloneness.

In a logical sequence Lady Macbeth who reached the peak of her endurance during the banquet scene laments in the unconsciousness of sleep the murders committed to secure her husband's kingship. She who destroyed herself that Macbeth might secure his own desires is unable to find peace. Her mind filled

MILTON (from page 182)

Then, at the crisis of Milton's poem, when Eve reached out and took the fruit and ate,

Earth felt the wound, and Nature from her seat
Sighing through all her works gave signs of woe,
That all was lost.

This upsetting of the divine order is linked with the beginning of woe when Dido and Aeneas met in the cave:

Then Earth and Juno, matron of honor, gave the sign;
lightning flashed and the conscious sky witnessed the union, and on the mountain top the nymphs raised a cry.

Of more incidental reminiscences there are many. Milton's epic similes are of course modeled on those of Homer and Virgil, and some draw material from either or both. The fallen angels lay in the fiery gulf

Thick as autumnal leaves that strow the brooks
In Vallombrosa—

the same kind of simile that Virgil applies to the shades of the dead who crowd to the bank of Acheron. At the end of Milton's first book the gigantic angel chiefs pouring into Pandemonium are likened to a swarm of bees, in terms that recall both the simile used of the busy builders of Carthage and the elaborate

account of bees in the fourth *Georgic*. Milton's simile of the bees prepares us for the angels shrinking in size in order to get inside the building. Now they are

like that Pygmean race

Beyond the Indian mount, or fairy elves,
Whose midnight revels, by a forest side
Or fountain, some belated peasant sees,
Or thinks he sees, while overhead the moon
Sits arbitress, and nearer to the Earth
Wheels her pale course.

Here, disregarding the poignancy of the Virgilian original, Milton adapts to his own decorative purpose Aeneas' sight of Dido in the underworld—when he recognized her dimly in the shadows, as one sees, or thinks he sees, the moon rising through the clouds at the beginning of the month. And, again in keeping with his own purpose, Milton's recollection of Virgil is blended with recollection of the *Midsummer Night's Dream*.

These are only a few examples of Milton's adaptations and re-creations. There are others; and one would need more than half an hour to speak of a topic that I have not touched at all, the resemblances between Milton's style and Virgil's. Both poets wear elaborate singing robes and use a medium far above the level of everyday speech. And, in a general way, Milton's blank verse, though swifter in movement, is the greatest English equivalent to Virgil's ocean roll of rhythm. But those things do not lend themselves to demonstration.

NOTES

¹ *Poetry Direct and Oblique* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1934), p. 190.

² "Structural Pattern in *Paradise Lost*," *Philological Quarterly*, xxviii (1949), 18-30.

³ *A Preface to Paradise Lost* (Oxford University Press, 1942), pp. 34-35.

CARTHAGE (from page 194)

erature, art, science, or religion bears their name. "Consequently, while Rome and Athens are still living forces in the mind of Europe, the ancient glory of Tyre is but

dimly remembered and a few broken stones are all that remains of the brilliant city which strove with Rome for the empire of the world."³³ It would seem that it is due to the Providence of God that Rome with its emphasis on duty, law, and order was permitted to unify the Mediterranean world, in order that the followers of Christ might have comparatively free access to all parts of the world. "It would have been unfortunate for any large part of Europe to fall permanently under their (Carthaginian) rule. By checking them in this direction, Rome was to do a good service to civilization."³⁴

EDWARD J. WOLTERS

Hope College, Michigan

NOTES

¹ Smith, R. B., *Carthage*, p. xi.

² Robinson, C. E., *History of Roman Republic*, p. 84.

³ Joshua 19: 29.

⁴ 2 Samuel 24: 7.

⁵ Isaiah 23: 7.

⁶ 1 Kings 16: 31; 18: 4, 19; 19: 2, 3.

⁷ Isaiah 23: 8.

⁸ Ezekiel 26: 17.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 26: 16.

¹⁰ Zechariah 9: 3.

¹¹ Joel 3: 6.

¹² Amos 1: 9.

¹³ Robinson, C. E., *History of Roman Republic*, p. 84.

¹⁴ Havell, H. L., *Republican Rome*, p. 160.

¹⁵ Frank, T., *Economic History of Rome*, p. 28.

¹⁶ Polybius 111: 22.

¹⁷ Frank, T., *Economic History of Rome*, p. 112.

¹⁸ Smith, R. B., *Carthage and the Carthaginians*, p.

49.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

²⁰ Cary, M., and Haarhoff, T. J., *Life and Thought*, p. 36.

²¹ Aristotle, *Politics*, 11, 2.

²² Smith, R. B., *Carthage and the Carthaginians*, p.

24.

²³ Heitland, W. E., *Roman Republic*, p. 188.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 188.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 188.

²⁶ Amos 6: 1.

²⁷ Havell, H. L., *Republican Rome*, p. 186.

²⁸ Kelsey, F. W., *Excavations at Carthage*, p. 5.

²⁹ Botsford, G. W., *History of Rome*, p. 97.

³⁰ Kelsey, F. W., *Excavations at Carthage*, p. 47.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

³² De Prorok, B. K., *Digging for Lost African Gods*, p. 97.

³³ Havell, H. L., *Republican Rome*, p. 158.

³⁴ Botsford, G. W., *History of Rome*, p. 97.

stones
which
of the
to the
ts em-
mitted
order
e com-
world.
or any
under
g them
d serv-

TERS

ic, p. 84.

ic, p. 84.

28.

112.
inians, p.

Thought,

inians, p.

8.

p. 5.

p. 47.

ican Gods,